CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A *Quarterly Journal* devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

| VOL. XIV | CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1919 | No. 2 |

Classical Philology

SCHERIA—CORCYRA

II

By A. Shewan

As already stated, Mure was of the opinion that the poet was describing a people whom he knew. In Appendix E to the first volume of his *Hist. Gk. Lit.* he goes farther and suggests that the Phaeacians were a colony of Φοίνικες, who were settled in Corcyra and who became "the butt of Homer's playful satire." Both Φαίηκες and Φοίνικες are devoted to navigation and characterized by an epithet denoting magnificence or ostentation; both are ναυσίκλυτοι and ἀγανοί. The Φοίνικες are, "in the true spirit of Homeric humour"—and we know how fond Homer is of paronomasia in a variety of forms—disguised as Φαίηκες.[1] If the lively ways of the Homeric Phaeacians are the opposite of the "gravity, or even gloom" of the Phoenicians it is suggested that, in the case of a Phoenician community that happened to be of a frivolous disposition, the contrast between such habits and the usual characteristics of the race might even add zest to the satire.

I venture to think, after prolonged examination of the literature of Scheria, that Mure's view is substantially correct and that in fact it only needs to be brought up to date. As we now know much more

---

[1] Schliemann, *Tiryns*, p. 24, note, mentions that Mahaffy thought Scheria might be a colony of Phocaeans who were thus taken off, but I cannot find Mahaffy's reference to the point.

about the early Mediterranean than was known in 1850, let us accept the guidance of the archaeologists and see if their discoveries assist the solution of our present problem. The study of the environment in or of which an old poet has written being admittedly a good guide to the proper understanding of his poetry, let us consider what has lately been revealed to us as to conditions in Greece and its surroundings in the age that is reflected in the Homeric epics.

First we have a long period of Minoan civilization in Crete with its headquarters at Knossos. Then comes a transfer of power to the mainland of Greece and the Mycenaean age begins. This continues during and ends with the period *ca.* 1350–1100 b.c., at or toward the close of which Knossos is destroyed. Homer—and in using the name I am following the archaeologists and disregarding the *inops turba* of the dissectors of the poems—flourished somewhat later. Our chief authority, Sir Arthur Evans, tells us in *J.H.S.*, XXXII, 277 ff., one of the most valuable papers on the succession of the Minoan and Mycenaean ages and the age of Homer, that Homer is "at most sub-Mycenaean." His floruit is on the borders of the geometrical period, and he describes the "chalco-sideric" age, anterior to his own, in which, though bronze was still in general use, iron was beginning to be turned to account. Already in the Second Late Minoan period there had been (*Scripta Minoa*, p. 56) "Minoan predominance, not to use a stronger expression, extending north of the gulf of Corinth," which in the chalco-sideric age had become "Mycenaean domination on the mainland of Greece," with its chief center, or at least one chief center, of power in the Peloponnesus. This is the political condition presupposed by the Homeric poems. Dr. Leaf and Professor Bury (*Quarterly Review* [July, 1916], p. 14) would "sweep away the Catalogue." To that one must object most strenuously. With or without it, however, we have in Homer, to use Professor Bury's words, "a consistent political map for 1200 b.c."

In the period preceding the Mycenaean, the Minoan empire, with its center at Knossos, had been extended far both east and west of the Mediterranean. For its influence in the West see *Scrip. Min.* (pp. 61 and 95 f.), Peet in *B.S.A.* (XIII, 405 ff.), and Myres in *Proceedings of the Classical Association* ([1911], pp. 50 ff.) and in *The Year's Work* ([1906], p. 27), referring to *J.H.S.* (XXIV, 125).

We read that there were settlements in Sicily, Italy, Sardinia, and Spain, and that there is abundant evidence of intercourse, in the late Minoan age, between the Aegean and Italy,[1] and between the Aegean and the head of the Adriatic, as shown by the remains of a Mycenaean colony at Torcello near Venice. For the early obsidian trade see the Hellenic Society's Phylakopi, volume, 233. It need not surprise us if we hear of a Minoan settlement in Corcyra. I have already argued that the island could not have been overlooked. It would be "useful for the coasting voyage to Sicily." See Burrows (p. 13, and p. 208, n. 6) on the possibility of "genuine Minoan traditions in the island." Corcyra would in fact be the Minoan traders' next landing-place after leaving Ithaka, which was the final port of call in Greece, on the voyage to the west, like Sicily and Sardinia farther on (Peet, *ut supra*, p. 420). Cf. Thompson on Leukas in *Liverpool Annals* (IV, 133). A Minoan settlement would be inevitable in an island so attractive and so incomparably situated as Corcyra.

"The Homeric poems," we read in *Scrip. Min.* (p. 61), "themselves afford a convincing proof that the traditions of the earlier Minoan and Mycenaean culture lived on in that of the Viking race of Greece," and Professor Burrows (p. 209) tells us that the story of the poems presupposes the civilization of Late Minoan III, a period in which, as we have seen, intercourse with the West was active. It is the sea lore of that age that is preserved in the *Odyssey* (Myres, *Geogr. Aspect*, p. 52, and Ramsay, *CR*, XVIII, 167). But we have in the epic only a tradition; there is no direct account of the Minoan empire, its connections, or its commerce. But we do have a description of its representatives and their proceedings in the Mediterranean. Homer's Φοίνικες are not Phoenicians; they are the Minoans. The distinction in Homer between Φοίνικες and Σιδόνιοι has not always been recognized, but it was seen by Gladstone (*Juv. Mundi*, p. 143, and *Synchronism*, p. 162, and cf. his remark quoted in *Scrip. Min.*, p. 94, note), by Hayman (App. D.), and by Seymour (*Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 52, note), who gives the Homeric references and the Homeric character, not a very high one, of these trafficking Φοίνικες or "red men." They have in these days come into their own as the

---

[1] It goes back even to the fourth millennium B.C. (Evans in *B.S.A.*, VIII, 123).

Minoans of the archaeologists see *Scrip. Min.* (pp. 56, 80); Fick (*Hattid.*, p. 4), referring to his *Ortsn.* (pp. 123 ff.), Burrows (p. 142), Frost (*J.H.S.*, XXXIII, 196, note), Aly (*loc. cit.*), Wace on Poulsen, *Year's Work* ([1913], p. 50), and on the subject generally, Hall (*B.S.A.*, VIII on "Keftiu and the Peoples of the Sea"). There is truth in the dictum of Assmann (*Das Floss der Odyssee*, p. 19), *ohne die Phoiniker hätten wir vielen von der Odyssee nicht, wahrscheinlich überhaupt keine Odyssee*, if for Phoinikes we now read Minoans.

Are there then any indications of a settlement of Φοίνικες, or Minoans, in Corcyra? Here I am glad to be able to accept, from what I may term the Cretan theory of Phaeacia adopted by Drerup and others, all the internal marks of Minoanism which they detect in Scheria, but I use them as showing, not that Scheria is Atlantis or a dim memory of Crete in the days of its Minoan glory, but that there was a settlement in Corcyra described to us by Homer under the name of Scheria. The points in question are stated by Drerup and Burrows, and by Krause (*Die Irrfahrten des Odysseus, Hermes*, L, 96 ff.). The Phaeacians, like the Minoans, were fond of music, song, and the dance (see *J.H.S.*, XXXII, 278; *B.S.A.*, IX, 110; *Scrip. Min.*, pp. 191 f., and cf. Gladstone, *Nineteenth Century* [1889], p. 292). The high position and freedom of women is another trait common to the two peoples. When we look at a reproduction of the fresco at Tiryns representing two ladies—but does not someone contend they are men?—standing in a car at a boar hunt, we think of Nausikaa[1] driving her team to the river, ἡ δὲ μάλ' ἡνιόχευεν . . . . νόῳ δ' ἐπέβαλλεν ἱμάσθλην. Koch (*Zur Stellung der Frau bei Hom.*, p. 9) says Areté is pre-Mycenaean, and Holsten (*Griech. Sittlichkeit in myken. Zeit*, p. 19 and note) notes Mycenaean features in the picture of Phaeacia. The association of Rhadamanthys with its people, mysterious as it must remain, will certainly be to some a Minoan bond. So far Ino, Odysseus' Savior from the waste of waters. Her name is pre-Hellenic and "leads to Crete" (Farnell in *J.H.S.*, XXXVI, 43). Again, pork in the Phaeacian dietary is, as Gladstone observed, another eastern mark, and swine were largely kept in Crete (*Scrip.*

---

[1] Was the comparison of the maiden to Artemis suggested to the poet by a local cult of the Πότνια Θηρῶν? Figurines of the huntress goddess, apparently of an archaic character, have been found in Corcyra (*B.S.A.*, XIV, 64).

Min., p. 133). For manners and costume see Bérard (I, 574 ff.); for the palace, with its θριγκὸς κυάνοιο—a substance "indications" of which were found in the palace at Knossos, see *B.S.A.* (VI, 10), Burrows (pp. 206, 209); and for the comfortable life, see Drerup, *Omero*, pp. 265 f. As regards place-names I have compared those in Fick's Cretan lists in *Hattid.* (pp. 8 ff.) with those for Corcyra given by Bursian and others and have found that the names which are similar in both correspond generally to those mentioned by Paulatos, ΠΑΤΡΙΣ (p. 56 and note), and which he says are not Greek but Semitic.

Certainly there are points of community. But then there are, as the upholders of the Cretan theory themselves admit, some very decided differences. Professor Burrows (p. 208, note) remarks on a difficulty as to boxing, which does not, however, appeal to me, as I explain elsewhere. And there is no reference to that peculiarly Minoan sport, the *taurokathapsia* or bull-baiting in the arena. Such reminiscences of the heyday of the Minoan empire could hardly have been omitted. And then the bow; οὐ γὰρ Φαιήκεσσι μέλει βιὸς οὐδὲ φαρέτρη, ζ 270, in Nausikaa's mouth, be it observed, and not the *bavardage* of her father. What of the "old Cretan tradition as famous bowmen" (*Scrip. Min.*, pp. 44 and 79; cf. *B.S.A.*, X, 59 ff., and Assmann in *Philolog.*, LXVII, 167)? And again, while the Minoan towns were open and unprotected save by "wooden walls," Scheria was carefully fortified against attack. Now it would surely be strange that there should be these marked contrasts if Homer were giving us a picture of Minoan Crete from memories of the famous days of the island realm, and stranger still if he was, as Sir Arthur Evans and others tell us, using Minoan tales or epics in which, one may be sure, the national characteristics would all be preserved, prominent, and unadulterated. But it is not strange if we regard the poet as describing a settlement of Minoans separated, perhaps long separated, from the parent stock and developing a local character of their own in a new island home. Different conditions produce different ways and manners. The Mycenaeans, for example, in the Peloponnesus, unlike their Minoan forbears at home, secured their capitals by massive walls. In Scheria, if of Minoan origin, we expect to find just such links with Cretan tradition as Macalister

(*op. cit.*, pp. 90 ff. and 114 f.) finds among another race of Minoan emigrants, the Philistines in Palestine. See the quotation from Winckler on page 94. Immigrants adopt the civilization and culture of the lands they seize. It was in this way, possibly, that the Scherians came to adopt the Achaean gods, just as those of Minoan Crete in the course of centuries took on Hellenic names and attributes.

Mycenaean remains have not, as has often been remarked, been found in Corcyra, but the island has not been thoroughly explored. Dörpfeld was conducting excavations just before the war. He is a man imbued, I might almost say above all others (see his "Confession of Homeric Faith," *Wochenschr. für Phil.* [1912], pp. 1081 ff.) with the reality and accuracy of the geography and topography and most other things in the poems, and he was convinced that he had found the site of Alkinoos' stronghold on the small peninsula of Kephali in the northwest of Corfu. See *Athen. Mitt.* (XXXIX, 175 f.), *J.H.S.* (XXXIII, 367 f.), the *Westminster Gazette* of February 9, 1914, and the *CW* ([1915], pp. 60 f.). He found there a pre-historic settlement with a small quantity of Mycenaean sherds, but that is the only Mycenaean sign. Bérard has found nothing on his site, but he is not an excavator. There were signs of only modern settlement, no ancient ruins, but it is a steep and rocky eminence that he has fixed on, and ancient remains may have dis-appeared from it entirely, as, I believe, in other similar cases. It may be added here that Bérard identifies Hypereia, the old home of the emigrants to Scheria, with Cumae, and Cumae is (*Scrip. Min.*, p. 95) the point on the Tyrrhene coast up to which Mycenaean remains have been found. The date of its foundation, even as a Greek settlement, was carried by tradition as far back as 1050 B.C. On this see Bérard (II, 118). Minoan discoveries since he wrote might induce him now to put the Phaeacian occupation of that place beyond the date mentioned. But his remark a propos of the reason for the migration of the Phaeacians is interesting—*l'histoire postérieure de Kume va nous montrer vingt exemples de pareilles hostilités.*

One discovery does point to Minoan occupations. In a paper already referred to (*J.H.S.*, XXXII) Sir Arthur Evans describes (p. 286) the pedimental sculptures of "an early temple" excavated by Dörpfeld at Palaeopolis in Corfu and finds that the essential

features are those of the Mycenaean tympanum. On either side of
the central divinity are "the animal guardians, in this case appar-
ently pards, heraldically posed," in short "the traditional Minoan
group." Now I do not think that it has occurred to anyone to
suggest that the κύνες of gold and silver which (η 88 ff.) adorned the
entrance to Alkinoos' palace, have any such significance. But if
Professor Perrin is right in supposing in his note (*ad. loc.*) that the
animals may have been sphinxes or griffins, which were sometimes
"attached to the column *like watchdogs* by a thong or chain" (Evans,
in *J.H.S.*, XXI, 159)[1] we surely have again the essentials of the tradi-
tional Minoan grouping. It is not expressly stated by Homer that
the κύνες were in a pediment, but the mention of the ὑπερθύριον or
lintel in the line immediately preceding may perhaps be taken as
indicating that such was the poet's meaning. See on this subject
Dussaud, *Civilisns. Préhelléniques*[2] (p. 459), where once again we
should perhaps read Minoans for Phoenicians. κύων, it should be
added, was used of a great variety of supernatural creations, including
the Sphinx herself (Roscher, *s.v.* "Kyon"). Even Homer does not
confine the word to dogs; in μ 96 it is a sea monster of some minor
kind. And lastly, as tending to confirm the Minoan connection, I
refer to the tale in Roscher (*s.v.* "Pandareos") of the similar κύων
χρυσοῦς Ἡφαιστότευκτος and even ἔμψυχος that guarded the shrine of
Zeus in Crete. In *B.S.A.* (VIII, 138, note) the animal is called "the
dog of Minos."[2]

For the golden statues of youths ἐνδμήτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν (η 100),
which held lighted torches inside the palace, I can find no parallel
from Minoan Crete. βωμοί or pedestals for lamps have been found,
but not, so far as I know, surmounted by λαμπαδηφόροι. The nearest
approach to these seems to be the Petsofa figurines, with a saucer
lamp on the head, mentioned in *B.S.A.*, IX, 372.

And then there are the various references in antiquity to the occu-
pation of Corcyra by Colchians. Dodwell, in his *Tour through
Greece* (I, 36), reports a tradition that as early as 1349 B.C., that is, in

---

[1] Cf. *B.S.A.*, VI, 40 for a doorway with "griffins facing it on either side."

[2] It may be worth noting that in another Cretan settlement, Gezer of the Philis-
tines, "architectural features of the Cretan type" have been found (*Scrip. Min.*,
p. 78).

the Mycenaean period, there was an immigration of Colchians, but
he does not give his authority, and I can obtain no confirmation.
Another, in Apollonius Rhodicus, is to the effect that Alkinoos
allowed the Colchians who pursued the Argonauts to settle in
Corcyra, where they stayed till the time of the Bacchiadae of Corinth,
when the Corinthians, according to Strabo (vi. 269), turned them out.
Cf. Wilamowitz (*H.U.*, pp. 170 ff.) and Nitzsch (*Anmkgn.*, II, 74).
The most likely settlers in prehistoric times would be the Minoans,
and if we cannot assume that the Minoans have been converted into
Colchians through the story of the Argonauts, they at least appear
to have been of the same kin.   Rawlinson (on Herodotus, I, 2) sug-
gested an ethnical relation between the Colchians and the Phoeni-
cians, or, as he might now say, the Minoans.   Herodotus regarded
the Colchians as Egyptians, a remnant of the army of Sesostris, but
his identifying marks might apply to Minoans.   The latter were
connected with the Anatolian stock (*Scrip. Min.*, p. 61, and *J.H.S.*,
XXXII, 279).   Trade connection between Crete, Egypt, and
Armenia, which bordered on Colchis, is proved by the archaeology
of the spiral form of ornamentation.   Mackenzie (*Myths of Crete*,
pp. 28 f., also p. 325) says that the Minoans penetrated the Dar-
danelles and tapped the trade which came from the East to the shores
of the Black Sea.   Colchis may have been a settlement of theirs.
Those who are now coming to believe that the rape of Helen was not
wholly mythical may perhaps go farther and believe that the carrying
off of Medea from Colchis was a reprisal for the abduction of Io by
Φοίνικες, or Minoans, and that Corcyra became involved in this feud
between East and West.   On the "debtor and creditor account" of
such abductions drawn up in later story, see Grote, *History* ([ed.
1888], I, 224, note), referring to the opening of Herodotus' history.
And finally there is the portrait figured by Sir Arthur Evans in a paper
in the *J.H.S.*, the reference to which I have lost, which is perhaps "the
actual likeness of a Minoan dynast," and is pronounced to be curi-
ously Armenoid in its general traits.   Now the Colchians are said
to have been of Armenoid race, and in Minoans and Egyptians,
according to Mackenzie (pp. 150 and 197), there was an Armenoid
strain.   But with this meager contribution I must leave the matter,
if it be worth pursuing, to wiser heads than mine in the hope that

further research will tend to identify these Colchians, in their old
home on the Euxine and in Corcyra, with the Minoans.

The Liburnians also had an ancient connection with Corcyra
which is perhaps worth noting. Bursian (*op. cit.*, II, 359, note)
quoted by Fick (*Hattid.*, p. 30) tells us that they were the oldest
inhabitants of Corcyra. They also (Smith's *Dict. Geog.*, *s.v.*)
occupied the northern part of Illyricum, having migrated there
from Italy, and Niebuhr considered them "Pelasgians." Cf. Helbig
in *Hermes* (XI, 257 ff.), who repeats the story that Idomeneus,
driven from Crete after the Trojan War, came to Illyricum and went
on thence with the Illyrians to Italy. Much the same was told of
Diomede. Meriones was said to have settled in Sicily. Bursian
(I, 17 f.) gives the tradition about the arrival of Helenus with a
Trojan band in Epirus. Cf. Bethe, *Rhein. Mus.*, LXV, 210, *nach
Sizilien wie nach Korkyra Splitter des Keftiuvolkes von Kreta aus
verschlagen sind*, and for an interpretation of the meaning of move-
ments of this kind see Casson, "The Dispersal Legend," in *CR*,
XXVII, 156a. They may reflect actual migrations from Crete to
Italy and a return movement thence to the neighborhood of Corcyra,
just of the nature of the one which Bérard and others see in the
Odyssean transfer of the Phaeacians from Hypereia to Scheria
(cf. Burrows, p. 208, n. 6). Fick and Kretschmer have noted many
linguistic indications of the early connection between the two shores
of the Adriatic. Ἰστώνη, a mountain in Corcyra, and Histonium
of the Frentani are only one of many such (Fick, *Ortsn.*, p. 142, and
Hattid., p. 31, quoting Helbig, *ut supra*).

But whether future investigations of the relation of the Colchians
and Liburnians to Corcyra and the mainland near it helps our present
view or not really matters little, for we have one fact which is as
nearly decisive as anything can be in regard to so remote a matter.
There was a Minoa in Corcyra (see Burrows, p. 13 and the reference
there). That is taken as a certain sign of Minoan occupation, and
it makes it more than mere hypothesis that it is a Minoan settlement
which Homer, with, if we please, added touches of fancy (Eustathius'
πλάσματα πιθανά) and certainly with humor playing over the whole,
has described for us in an imperishable lay. Bergk (*Hist. Gk. Lit.*,
p. 787) saw in it *Dichtung und Wahrheit verschmolzt*. The poet

followed the *Volksglaube* in its mingling of fiction with truth. Cor-
cyra, on the borderland between Greece and the West, was a likely
locality to tempt to such treatment, "mixed treatment," as Glad-
stone calls it (*Juv. Mund.*, pp. 476 f.). The regions beyond were in a
sense the haunts of mystery, and the jurisdiction of the god Poseidon,[1]
from whom pre-Achaean families or peoples like the Phaeacians and
the Cyclopes traced their descent, and the theme of the life and ways
there must, as the *Odyssey* shows, have been an attractive one to the
Achaeans of the Greek mainland.

It is likely enough, when one considers how it has struck some
authorities, that Homer is describing the people and the locality
from personal observation, and certainly it is quite possible that the
poet himself had visited Corcyra. That he was a traveler no one
can doubt who reads his works, notes how much of the earth he has
seen with his own eyes, and recalls his remarkable simile in O 80 ff.:
ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀίξῃ νόος ἀνέρος, ὅς τ' ἐπὶ πολλὴν γαῖαν ἐληλυθὼς φρεσὶ
πευκαλίμῃσι νοήσῃ, "ἔνθ' εἴην, ἢ ἔνθα," μενοινήῃσί τε πολλά. And if,
as tradition asserts and as seems certain on his own description of
the island, he actually visited Ithaka, it is as likely as not that he
went on to Corcyra. There was, in the view of W. H. Jones in *CR*
(XXIV, 208), no prejudice against the foreigner to stay Homer from
such an excursion. Gandar, in his interesting study, *Homère et la
Grèce contemporaine*, is quite ready to believe that he made the trip.

On the island he finds a Minoan community and the materials
for his beautiful Nausikaan idyl and his character sketch of the
people and their king. Their vanity and the mild vaporing and
postprandial weakness of their ruler amuse him, and he immortalizes
them by incorporating them in the story of Odysseus. There may
even have been—who knows?—another motive. We have only to
read the Phaeacian books and the *Apologoi* to appreciate the im-
portance attached to the function of πομπή. Other peoples and
personages practice it as occasion requires, but the Phaeacians are
πομπῆες *par excellence*, πομποὶ ἀπήμονες ἀπάντων. They help *all* on
their way; it is their standing occupation (cf. θ 31 ff. and Bérard,
I, 559 ff.). They are intermediaries between the Achaean world and

---

[1] A Minoan god in origin, according to Miss Harrison. See the *Annual Report
of the Hellenic Society* for 1913–14, p. 5.

the wild west. Bérard compares the Neleids in the south. The men of Corcyra had probably something like a monopoly of the traffic across the Otranto channel, often, as Bérard tells us, a perilous bit of navigation. They no doubt waxed fat on the business, as Mycenae and Troy did, and Homer, as firm a believer in the doctrine of the φθόνος θεῶν as Herodotus was later, sees in this material for the further embellishment of his picture, ψεύδεσι σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι. The Phaeacians are obviously committing, as Bérard says, *deux sacrilèges*. The speed of their ships is unearthly and provocative, and they are outraging the god—if Miss Harrison is right, their own Minoan god—who presided over that waste of sea by robbing it of its terrors and cheating him of his legitimate victims. And so we owe to the poet's imagination thus kindled the incidents of the prophecy of Nausithoos, the petrifaction of the ship, and the origin of the mountain that cut off Scheria from the interior.

My readers need not remind me that this is speculation and that nothing of the sort is proved or susceptible of proof. I know it, but I can without a blush go farther. It is even possible that the poet is giving poetical embodiment and color to an experience of his own. If at Scheria he suffered from a hitch in the arrangements he desired for further exploration or for getting back to Achaean lands, there would be a motive for the employment of his gentle satire. At any rate I find it as easy to believe as that he was converting wild sprites of the ocean, or Valkyries, or ferrymen of the dead, or denizens of the infernal regions into simple, jovial, hardworking seamen. Rather, Phaeacia is real and the poet is in earnest about the island community. If Professor Bury, as many will allow, has reason when he says (*op. cit.*, p. 17) that "Mr. Leaf is assuredly right in asserting the reality of Agamemnon and Menelaus," why should we hesitate about Alkinoos? It is now many years since Sir William Ramsay observed that the learned world was coming round to Gladstone's faith in the reality of the life in the Homeric poems, and every year since has seen the truth of the observation more and more confirmed. And Gladstone agreed with Mure as to Phaeacia. I close with the hope that I have shown some reason for believing that they were right and that Alkinoos and his folk are οὐκ ὄναρ ἀλλ' ὕπαρ ἐσθλόν.

ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND

THE ANTECEDENTS OF HELLENISTIC COMEDY

By Henry W. Prescott

VI

Even if, as I have suggested,[1] the indebtedness of comedy to Euripides in the material of plot is not so large in amount or so significant in kind as modern critics have represented, it still remains quite possible that in form comedy is dependent upon Euripidean tragedy. Into a mold provided by a different type of literature comedy may have poured a new content. Indeed it is undoubtedly the striking contrast between the looser epirrhematic and episodic structure of Aristophanic comedy and the organic coherence of Hellenistic comedy, as seen in the Roman copies, that has led modern scholars to reject the ancient theory in the prolegomena and to stress heavily the broad resemblance, in point of unity, between later comedy and Euripides. Nor do the variations in the structure of Aristophanic comedy effected by the postponement of the *agon* to the second half of the play, and by the diminished rôle of the chorus in the *Ecclesiazusae* and the *Plutus*, very appreciably lessen the gap in this respect between Aristophanic and Hellenistic comedy.

Taking organic structure in the broadest sense, before we immediately accept the Euripidean theory, must we not ask ourselves, in view of the fact that there is no full and specific relation between the plots of Euripides and those of the later comedy of manners, whether the comic plot of the later period, without any immediate intervention of earlier or contemporary tragedy, does not bring into the comic drama at once a degree of coherent structure that the mere themes of Aristophanic comedy made impossible in the scurrilous plays of the fifth century? These comic plots of the fourth and later centuries are not homogeneous; the twenty-six Roman plays reveal a variety of plots, and the Greek titles and fragments increase this variety. The comedy of manners, with which alone we are at present concerned, may have been a renascence of one kind of Sicilian-Attic comedy, or it may have issued immediately from the private life

[1] *CP*, XIII (1918), 113 ff.

of the fourth century.   Its precise origin does not matter for our present purpose.   Of its various plots a common one, which we may use for illustration, is the story of a young lover prevented from indulging his love for a courtezan by obstacles, usually of a pecuniary sort;   the lover himself, or a slave, or parasite obtains the required financial help, usually through some swindling intrigue, and, often further assisted by the discovery of the courtezan's free birth, attains his end.[1]   That such a plot is the issue of any slow literary evolution is difficult for me to believe.   The broad outline of this story offers in itself a beginning, middle, and end, with obstacles and means of solution that are easily varied and multiplied.

It is quite superfluous for tragedy to superimpose upon this type of plot a general coherence and logical organization which it already possesses.   It is, on the other hand, quite true that mythological comedy,[2] which had prevailed in the period immediately preceding the vogue of the comedy of manners, had in many instances acquired an organic structure by being a travesty of well-organized tragedy; and one cannot easily say how conscious of the advantages of an organic form comic poets may have become through constant witnessing of tragic dramas as well as by intermittent perversions of tragic plots.   My point is merely that the material of the comic plots is almost entirely independent of tragedy, and that the unity, in a broad sense, is possibly furnished, without any long period of artistic development, by the simple realistic tale of human experiences.

[1] The theme is a variant of the eternal commonplace which Post (*Harv.'Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXIV [1913], 112) reduces to a formula.   The broad similarity to the plots of later Greek romances is obvious.   The romances themselves, however, are often called *dramata* by their authors;   this implication of dramatic influence upon the romances makes it difficult to assert that early prose fiction, no longer extant, contributed to the material of comedy.   But the possibility is always open;   for interesting reflections cf. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, 118 ff.;   Bousset, *Ztschr. für die neutestamentl. Wiss.*, V (1904), 18 ff.;   Mendell, *CP*, XII (1917), 161 ff.;   and specially Thiele, *Hermes*, XLVIII (1913), 536, n. 1, 539, n. 1.

[2] The salient facts regarding mythological comedy seem to me to be that (1) oral tale and epic must have brought some unity into mythological comedy before tragedy exerted any influence;   (2) that the influence of tragedy was exerted probably as early as the time of Epicharmus;   (3) that mythological comedy was probably infinitely varied, (a) as illustrated by the *Plutus*, which suggests the loose unity provided by the application of a legend with allegorical implications to contemporary life, (b) by the *Dionusalexandros*, in which fantastic perversion of myth could hardly have promoted unity at all, (c) by the *Amphitruo*, which shows the high degree of unity attainable through the fusion of a tragic plot with a comedy of errors.

Politics, literature, and philosophy did not supply Aristophanes with
themes that were inherently dramatic and easily organized into
effective dramatic chapters, but typical experiences of real life, such
as the recurrent plots of New comedy reveal, hardly need the impress
of tragedy before they can assume at least a considerable degree of
organic unity.

However abstract and a priori this reasoning is (as it must be in
the dearth of positive evidence), it is interesting to observe that
before the middle of the fourth century the general coherence of the
comedy of manners is recognized by a comic poet, Antiphanes; the
invention of the presuppositions, of the facts of the plot, of the exposi-
tion, and of the catastrophe, in comedy as well as in tragedy, he seems
to view in a detached and conscious fashion and to describe them in
terms that to some extent suggest an almost academic attitude toward
dramatic structure and an apparatus of technical labels. He is
referring to the advantages of tragedy in dealing with stories familiar
to the audience, supplied with characters whose names and expe-
riences are already known, and in having the *mechane* available for
emergency; in contrast therewith he puts the comic poets who have
to *invent* everything—new names, presuppositions, plot, catastrophe,
exposition. It should be clearly understood that the fragment refers
to the invention of the *facts* of exposition, catastrophe, presupposi-
tions, and main action; the *form* of the comic plot, apparently, is
assumed to be approximately that of the tragic plot, and the labels
are applicable to both types.[1]

Modern criticism, however, does not limit itself to a statement
that the coherence, in a very broad sense, of later comedy is largely

[1] . . . .
ἡμῖν δὲ ταῦτ' οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ πάντα δεῖ
εὑρεῖν, ὀνόματα καινά, <
                      >κἄπειτα τὰ διῳκημένα
πρότερον, τὰ νῦν παρόντα, τὴν καταστροφήν,
τὴν εἰσβολήν. ἂν ἕν τι τούτων παραλίπῃ
Χρέμης τις ἢ Φείδων τις, ἐκσυρίττεται·
Πηλεῖ δὲ ταῦτ' ἔξεστι καὶ Τεύκρῳ ποιεῖν.
                         [Athen. 222 A, frag. 191, Kock]
    The contrast between Chremes and Pheidon, on the one hand, and Peleus and
Teucer, on the other, seems to make certain an allusion to a comedy of manners, not
to mythological travesty. The complications, the *epitasis* of Donatus on Terence,
are covered, if at all, only in τὰ νῦν παρόντα. It is quite possible that Antiphanes is
referring mainly to exposition and solution. Ancient literary criticism of comedy,

effected under the influence of the organic structure of Greek tragedy.
It undertakes to establish a more specific structural relation between
the two types.[1]   The Latin plays reveal in the text conditions that
point to the possibility of a "vacant stage" at intervals in the
production of a given play; taking some but not all of these possibly
"vacant stages" to be indications of real and essential pauses in the
action, modern critics posit a division of the Latin plays into chapters
of action which in Roman comedy is supposed to be an obscured
reproduction of more clearly marked act division in the Greek
originals; this act division in the Greek originals is itself supposed
to be the result of a development in which tragedy plays a dominant
part.   For later Greek comedy seems on occasion, if not always, to
have separated chapters of action from one another by an inorganic
intermezzo chorus, or interlude scenes, or flute music—all of which
might easily be substitutes for a relatively organic inter-act chorus
such as, in Greek tragedy, regularly divides, or connects, the six or
seven smaller chapters of action which constitute the play.   The
"vacant stages," therefore, of the Latin plays become a final issue
in the development from a choral drama in which the chorus is
organic, through later Greek comedy in which inorganic features,
largely musical and often choral, marked the end of acts, to a dramatic
form in which "vacant stages" providing essential pauses in the

as it issues in Euanthius and Donatus, deserves more attention than it has received;
the theory of structure in these Latin comments on Terence may be patchwork in its
present form, but it has remote and honorable antecedents.   On *katastrophe* and
eisbole cf. Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], 233, and nn. 1, 2; on *katastrophe* I might add the mime
(vs. 16) edited by Koerte, *Archiv. für Papyrusforsch.*, VI (1913), 1 ff., with which cf.
katastole in another mime (*Oxyrhynch. Pap.*, III, No. 413, vs. 95) and in the scholium
on Aristoph. *Peace* 1204.

[1] If any complete analysis of the internal structure of the Latin plays had been
made, I should naturally discuss it at this point.   In default of such a study and for
convenience in my own exposition I take up the theory of act division; for, though
this problem is a matter of external and mechanical structure from one standpoint,
Leo and other critics assert that the choral songs of tragedy set off logical units, and
that the act division in Roman comedy often coincides with the logical chapters of the
plot, as, e.g., Act I, Exposition; II–III, Complication; IV–V, Solution.   This asser-
tion, so far as Greek tragedy is concerned, is vigorously contested by Holzapfel,
Kennt die griech. Tragödie eine Akteinteilung? (Giessen, 1914), who convinces himself
that choral stasima are not at all regularly the boundaries of logical chapters, although
tragedy does provide "bestimmte Richtlinien für das Entstehen von fünf Akten"
(p. 96).   I have accepted, however, Leo's assumptions in the argument above without
raising the question whether or not the so-called acts in tragedy or comedy are logical
units; it seems proper to meet Leo on his own ground.

action supplant the interludes that in the earlier forms kept the scenic background constantly occupied.[1]

For brevity, I may state somewhat categorically the generally accepted facts, so far as I can discover them in the tangle of modern discussion: (1) Sophoclean and Euripidean tragedies fall into six or seven chapters of action set off by choral songs. (2) The *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus* of Aristophanes are susceptible of division into six or seven chapters; Aristophanes is supposed by some scholars to have written for these later plays choral interludes, many of which have not survived. (3) Hellenistic theory, perhaps derived from contemporary practice, divided tragedy into five acts; the practice is perhaps reflected in Senecan tragedy. (4) There is no evidence that Hellenistic comedy operated regularly with a theory of five acts, though the *Epitrepontes* of Menander seems, in its present fragmentary condition, to have indications of at least four acts set off by the label *chorou*, and the *komos*-chorus is here and elsewhere in New comedy a distinguishing mark of division into *mere*. (5) It is evident that Varro and others, probably under the influence of Hellenistic theory and method, attempted with difficulty to divide the plays of Terence into five acts, and sixteenth-century editors of Plautus somewhat violently followed a similar procedure in their texts of the poet. That either Plautus or Terence consciously organized his plays into any definite number of acts is made unlikely by the known facts of Varronian act division and by the present condition of the texts, but either or both may, distinctly or obscurely, reflect act division in their Greek originals. (6) In Leo's attempt to discriminate *mere* in the Roman plays, using "vacant stages" and other criteria, the number of such acts varies from a minimum of three to a maximum of seven: about one-third of the total number of plays have five acts, the four-act and six-act plays are almost as numerous as the five-act plays, and divisions into three and seven acts are represented each by several plays.[2]

[1] In Leo's view plots of intrigue force the organic chorus out of the comedy of manners (*Der Monolog*, 39, 41), and ultimately the inorganic chorus is replaced by flute music or by spoken interlude (*Pl. Forsch.*[2], 227, n. 3).

[2] For the facts in this paragraph and further details cf. Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], 226 ff.; *Der Monolog*, 49 ff.; Legrand, *Daos*, 464 ff. On the fragment of the *Epitrepontes*, which adds a new *chorou* to the play, cf. *Oxyrhynch. Pap.*, X (1914), 88 ff. For a brief summary and critique cf. Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy* (1915), 1 ff., ably reviewed by Flickinger, *Class. Weekly*, X (1916–17), 147 ff.

This array of facts, it seems to me, is far from satisfactory as a support for the view that Hellenistic comedy owes its structural organization to tragedy.   The relation between tragedy and the two later plays of Aristophanes may or may not be significant, but how or why in the Hellenistic period a five-act theory or practice developed in tragedy is unknown, and that a five-act division, or any other uniform act division, prevailed in Hellenistic comedy is not substantiated by the evidence.   In tragedy the chorus is the germ of the dramatic form, and as such is an inalienable organic element, which, with an occasional exception such as Agathon's *embolima*, only slowly acquires a detachable inorganic character.   In comedy the chorus, though relatively organic in the first part of an Aristophanic play, becomes generally inorganic in the second part, in which often topical songs set off episodic dialogue; and the somewhat dubious early history of the type provides for a chorus only as an alien element. In brief, for the broad characteristics of the Menandrian *komos* as an inorganic element (also, of course, as composed of drunken revelers primarily) every preparation is made in earlier comedy; tragedy, on the other hand, offers inherent obstacles to such a development.   It is true, however, that early comedy, as we now know it, does not furnish a structure in which logically connected chapters of dialogue are consistently set off by choral songs; this structure, now vaguely indicated in the *Epitrepontes*, finds a better background in fifth-century tragedy than in any known form of earlier comedy.   We might easily admit the influence of tragedy in this matter if we were not troubled by the thought that in non-scurrilous comedy of the fifth century the chorus, if it continued to be employed, might have affected the structure of the plays and established a form which we may describe as resembling the present text of the *Plutus*, but with choral interludes replacing the label *chorou* in the present text of that play.   This form need not have been so directly due to the influence of tragedy, but may have arisen as a compromise between non-choral Sicilian comedy and choral scurrilous comedy.   In any case it is well to remember that, however a chorus may find its way into the drama at the start, once there it is very quickly made to perform desirable economic functions; the economic necessity of working with a limited number of actors and the artistic regard for a plausible representation, however rough, of the lapse of time are neatly satisfied by the

choral interlude; and in a non-choral drama the same objects are obtained by interlude music, by stationary scenes, or by substantial pauses. One would suppose, however, if the chorus or any kind of interlude is so important for economic purposes, that such interludes would for a considerable period in the development of drama appear whenever the dramatist needed to cover time for off-stage action, or for change of rôles, or both, and that therefore the logical unity of a chapter of action between two interludes would not be a primary consideration. It is of course likely that a new phase of action will begin after an interlude, and in course of time a conscious regard for symmetry may lead to the demarcation of logical units by interludes; and ultimately such logical chapters may be fixed in number. There is no evidence that they did become so fixed in later Greek or Roman comedy, but only that a varying number of chapters is set off by various sorts of interludes.

In the Latin plays, if one is not blinded by the Euripidean theory, the visible facts are, first and primarily, that the structure in general points to a concern in the Roman theater for continuous action rather than for action interrupted by substantial pauses, least of all by any regularly recurring number of pauses in individual plays;[1] secondly, that there are in some plays conditions which, obscurely or distinctly, suggest a division into *mere* in the Greek originals.

May I illustrate from the *Persa* my own attitude toward "vacant stages" and consequent act division, so far as Roman productions are concerned? There are six possible vacant stages, at 52, 167, 250, 328, 399, and 752. At 53 ff. Saturio's monologue fills the interval of Toxilus' absence; in other words, it performs the same function as the vacant stage posited at 52, with the added and, of course, essential function of introducing us to the character of the parasite. At 168 ff. Sophoclidisca's patter-talk fills the interval of Toxilus' absence (167–83), again precisely what a substantial pause at 167 would have accomplished; why duplicate the devices for filling time intervals?[2] At 250 Sagaristio's monody similarly fills the interval

---

[1] For the details of an argument along these lines cf. Conrad, *op. cit.*

[2] An argument that, for example, more time is needed between 167 and 183 than is provided by the text of 167–82, and that therefore a substantial pause at 167 is required in addition to 167–82, is made difficult by the general consideration of time intervals in comedy such as Conrad sketches (*op. cit.*, 19–34).

between the departure and return of Paegnium and links two chapters
of the action.   At 752, just as 738–52 have made it possible for Toxi-
lus departing at 737 to return at 753, so 753–76 are arranged to allow
Dordalus, making his exit at 752, to return in 777; in brief, the action
around the supposed vacant stage is obviously so interlocked as to
serve the same economic purpose that a substantial pause in the
action at 752 would adequately meet; accordingly the substantial
pause becomes quite unlikely.   With regard to 328 and 399 the case
is different, and taken by themselves these places admit pauses so
far as the text is concerned, but (1) if the other four supposed pauses
are rightly eliminated it is not likely that these two places, only
seventy lines apart, mark substantial breaks in otherwise continuous
action; (2) a pause at 399 breaks the action at a point at which rapid
action in the execution of the intrigue is highly desirable; (3) if my
suggestions in *CP*, XI, 129, n. 2 have any validity, the distribution
of rôles might point to 306–28 as devised, in part, to provide for
Sophoclidisca's assuming the rôle of the parasite at 329, a condition
which would make unlikely a pause at 328.[1]

Now if we turn from the Latin play to the Greek original and ask
ourselves whether any or all of the six possible pauses in the Latin
text of the *Persa* were either real pauses or musical interludes of some
sort in the Greek text, we face a very difficult question.   We observe
that the Latin text does not, implicitly or explicitly, suggest the
existence in the Greek original of an inorganic chorus.   And the
same arguments against flute music would apply to the Greek original
(if its text was essentially the same as the Latin text) as we have
applied to four of the supposed vacant stages of the Latin copy.   On
the other hand, if the Greek text was essentially different from the
Latin text, and if interludes other than monologue and monody took
the place of the parasite's monologue, of Sophoclidisca's talk, Saga-
ristio's monody, etc., we have difficulty in imagining just how the
Greek play could have been constructed, and we also have to admit
an extraordinary, not to say incredible, originality on the part of

[1] That is, if there were a substantial pause at 328, this pause would supply the
time needed for change of rôles, and the present condition of the text, as regards 306–28,
would not be so easily explained.   But of course I do not contend that the distribution
of rôles in this play is so certain as to lend any great weight to this point.

Plautus.[1]   I leave to partisans of act division the issue; for myself I
seriously question whether the Greek original of the *Persa* in these
large structural features was essentially different from the present
Latin text.

Granting this, I observe with perfect equanimity that the
Heautontimorumenos[2] contains evidence that an inorganic chorus
operated in the Greek original; some of the vacant stages in the
Latin text very distinctly point to interludes in the Greek performance
such as we seem to have indicated in the *Epitrepontes*.   And this
diversity, represented in two plays, I feel perfectly free to extend
indefinitely, not being hampered by any theory of exclusive or large
dependence upon Greek tragedy, which inclines modern critics to
put Hellenistic comedy in a strait-jacket of uniformity and regularity.[3]

<div align="center">VII</div>

The discussion of vacant stages and of act division is much
affected by the view that these and other aspects of Hellenistic and
Roman comedy are the issues of a development from choral to non-
choral drama.   This development is suggested by many visible
conditions in the texts of Old and New comedy and is explicitly
stated in ancient theory, which describes Old comedy as choral and
later comedy as at first removing the chorus but leaving a place for it,
and then not even leaving a place for it.   The last two periods of
development in ancient theory are represented respectively by

---

[1] It may be observed that there are no monologues before 52, 167, and 250 (a very
brief one before 167).   This condition suggests that the solo speeches and songs at
52 ff., 167 ff., and 250 ff. are surrogates in a non-choral drama of a chorus in choral
drama, in so far as they fill intervals of time primarily, though not exclusively, as does
a chorus.   Why may they not have performed this function in the Greek original?

[2] The conditions are particularly good at 409, where a night intervenes; at 748,
where the *ancillae* may pass across the stage; and at 873, where the old men re-enter,
having just left the stage at 872.   At 229 I see no clear evidence of a break in the
action; nor am I fully convinced by the arguments of Skutsch and Flickinger regarding
the condition of the Greek original at 170.

[3] The technique which I discern in the Greek original of the *Persa* is roughly
analogous to admittedly Greek technique in other Roman plays in which interlude
scenes, spoken or sung, are found, e.g., *Captivi* 460–98, 909–21, *Curc.* 462–86, *Most.*
313–47 (cf. Leo, *Der Monolog*, 59 and n. 2, *Pl. Forsch.*², 227, n. 3). Leo's contention that
such spoken and sung interludes are substituted in the Greek originals for the chorus
only relatively late and in the period of the *technitae*, I should meet with the question
why they might not have appeared at any time in a non-choral drama.

Menander and by the Latin poets; and the Latin poets, by not even leaving a place for the chorus, made difficult a division into the five acts which in the Greek originals were clearly distinguished by choral passages or by the label *chorou*.[1]   That Menandrian comedy often justified such a statement of the case I see no reason to question. But ancient theory, as I have elsewhere indicated (*CP*, XII, 409), seems to be operating with a selected mass of material; when it speaks of Old comedy it betrays no knowledge of Crates and Phere-crates; when it discusses New comedy it often, as above, concentrates upon Menander.   We may concede, however, the truth and value of the broad generalization in ancient theory without closing our minds to other facts.   A non-choral type of drama has problems in common with choral drama but must meet them without a chorus. Such problems, for example, are presented by a limited number of actors, by the necessity of covering plausibly time intervals, and by peculiarities of the stage setting.   Time for off-stage action and for change of rôles is easily provided by a chorus, whether organic or inorganic; non-choral drama is driven to a variety of substitutes for the chorus—to lyrical intermezzos by single actors or small groups of actors, to instrumental music, to dances, to monologues, or to dialogue scenes that may not always promote the action.   It requires not a little skill to bridge gaps with scenes, whether spoken or sung, which are inseparable organic units and are not too manifestly mere bridges.   With these considerations in mind we may better appreciate the most striking feature of the technique of New comedy.

The difference between my own views and the tendencies of modern criticism may be illustrated by a brief criticism of Leo's theory of the monologue.[2]   To understand his argument we must outline the results of his study, which, by its scope, by the thorough marshaling of material, by the nice discrimination of stylistic qual-ities, and by the historical perspective of the investigator, excites the greatest admiration and doubtless carries conviction.   Racial psy-chology prepares us for an extensive use of solo speeches in Greek liter-ature.   This tendency of the race is definitely limited in fifth-century

[1] Euanthius *De fabula* iii. 1 (Wessner, I, 18); for further details cf. Conrad, *op. cit.*, 8 ff., and footnotes.

[2] For brevity, following Leo, I use "monologue" to cover solo speech and solo song; nor do I always differentiate soliloquy in the narrow sense.

drama by the presence of a chorus.   Only before the entrance of the
chorus is genuine solo speech available.   To this limitation set by
a chorus Aeschylus and Sophocles in the main submit.   Euripides,
however, strains against the barrier of the chorus.   His interest in
solo speech led to a steady development toward a detachable prologue
in the only part of the play in which he was free from the handicap
of a chorus.   Within the play, between the entrance and the exit
songs of the chorus, a similar progress appears toward the increasing
use of quasi-monologues—the prayer monologue, the address to the
elements and inanimate surroundings that gradually reverts to
actors or chorus, and pathetic speech that disregards the presence of
chorus and actors; rarely too he removes the barrier to solo speech
and, withdrawing the chorus, as, for example, in the *Helena*, finds
expression in more nearly genuine solo speech.   The quasi-
monologues in the presence of the chorus Leo finds most frequently
just after a choral song and at the beginning of a *meros;* in a relatively
few cases they appear just before a choral song and at the end of a
meros.   The goal toward which Euripides was tending, hampered
by the chorus, is clearly indicated in the *Helena*, a play which in so
many other features of form and content anticipates later comedy.
In this play Euripides reveals what he would have done without a
chorus; here the *mere*, or acts, of the drama are bracketed between
monologues with remarkable regularity.   The immediate issues of
this technique Leo sees in Roman comedy.   The Euripidean prologue
is firmly established in many plays of Plautus.   The monologue, now
that there is no chorus, is freely extended within the plays of Plautus
and Terence, and it brackets with some regularity in many plays
those units of action which Leo discriminates as *mere*.[1]

My objection to Leo's inferences from the facts is that a sig-
nificance is attached to many phenomena which they will not bear.
So far as the position of the monologue is concerned, it is clear that
(apart from "asides," with which Leo is not primarily occupied) the
monologue as a solo speech must appear at the beginning or at the
end of units of the action; at these points, only, the stage is cleared of
other characters, and solo speech is possible; under any other con-
ditions a solo speech must be delivered over the heads of other actors

[1] For a brief résumé of his argument cf. *Der Monolog*, 53.

or the chorus. In Euripidean tragedy the chorus is usually present, and the dramatist can best introduce his surrogates of the monologue only when the scene of action is relatively clear, that is, just before or after a choral song.[1] In non-choral drama a vast majority of monologues must appear just before the arrival or after the departure of other characters. In brief, in each type of drama the position of the monologues or quasi-monologues is largely inevitable, and it is accordingly unsafe to infer from the position of solo speeches that one type of drama has influenced the other type. The most that may be said is that Euripidean tragedy (or later Euripidean tragedy) and New comedy (at least Philemon and possibly Diphilus, according to Leo) prefer to begin new phases of the action with solo speech rather than with dialogue and much less regularly to end such chapters of the action similarly.

Now this fact, just stated, may be significant and may repay careful study, but so far as Leo's main thesis is concerned, viz., that the quasi-monologues in Euripides, limited in quantity and variety, are opening the way toward the vast number of monologues in comedy, most of which are entirely different in content from their supposed Euripidean forbears, and further, that a bracketing of acts in New comedy results from Euripidean practice in this regard, we must observe, not only that the position of the monologue is an unsafe criterion and that the qualitative and quantitative differences between the two types are remarkable, but that the regularity of act structure posited by Leo for New comedy is not established by the evidence.

Leo's statements of fact are full and frank, but naturally he does not throw into bold relief the obstacles to his theory. With some measure of success he finds in the Latin plays (only three) adapted from originals by Philemon the bracketing of *mere* by monologues.[2] Of Menander's technique he can get no clear idea because, as he asserts, so many of Menander's originals are contaminated in the Roman copies[3]; and in trying to account for contradictory conditions within the group of contaminated plays Leo displays an almost

---

[1] These somewhat obvious facts are sensibly stated by Legrand, *Daos*, 490.

[2] *Der Monolog*, 49–53.

[3] *Ibid.*, 55 ff.

acrobatic versatility.[1] Nor is Diphilus' practice easily determined
from the two Latin plays, one of which is contaminated, that come
from his hand.   Of ten plays not traceable to any of these three
playwrights Leo finds his norm of act structure fairly well established
in all but three, the *Epidicus*, the *Curculio*, and the *Asinaria*.[2]   Even
this statement of Leo's makes a rather weak case for any dominant
Euripidean influence.   Without stressing statistics[3] one may fairly
describe the situation in the following terms: Not a single Latin play
has all its acts bracketed by monologues; ten plays, only two of which
are contaminated, have absolutely no acts bracketed by monologues;
eight plays alone contribute the slightest support to Leo's theory, so
far as they have a reasonable percentage of acts bracketed by mono-
logues (and to be quite fair I have called a little less or more than half
a reasonable percentage); the other eight plays lie between the two
extremes. If Leo contends that it is not fair to rest his case on
bracketing, but that we should consider, apart from the bracketing,
the proportion of acts that either begin or end with monologues, the
figures are these: There are 130 opportunities to begin acts with
monologues, of which the Latin plays accept 78; there are 104[4]
opportunities to end acts with monologues, of which 31 are accepted.
In other words, more than half the acts begin with monologues,
and less than a third end with monologues.   Or finally, not to neglect
any angle, two-thirds of all the entrance monologues of Roman

[1] Thus, for example, the *Casina*, from the Greek of Diphilus, does not accord with
Leo's expectation of acts bracketed by monologues; the *Rudens*, from the same Greek
author, does accord; Leo (*ibid.*, 54) is confirmed in his view that the *Casina* is contami-
nated, and he sees in that play Plautine technique.   The *Andria*, though rich in mono-
logues, has no bracketing of acts; Leo (*ibid.*, 57) remarks that Menander's composition
has disappeared in the process of contamination, and that Terence's technique is that
of the *Casina*.   The *Stichus*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Miles gloriosus*, on the other
hand, are fairly regular in the bracketing of acts; Leo concludes (*ibid.*, 56, 60–61)
that Plautus has observed and followed the technique of his Greek originals!   Obvi-
ously, if one accepts Leo's theory of contamination and of the monologue, these are
the only possible conclusions, but does such versatility in meeting contradictory
conditions in supposedly contaminated plays stimulate confidence in theories either of
contamination or of the monologue?

[2] *Ibid.*, 59 ff.

[3] The figures that follow are based on Leo's own interpretations, though he
furnishes no statistics.

[4] The difference between 130 and 104 is due to the fact that, conventionally, the
last act of a Roman play usually ends with dialogue in trochaic septenarii, so that a
monologue at the end of the play and of the last act is practically impossible.

comedy (not including the *Zutrittsmonolog*) stand at the beginning of acts; slightly more than two-thirds of the exit monologues stand at the end of acts. In my opinion there are hardly more than two significant facts in the situation: first, as we should expect, monologues stand at the beginning or end of smaller or larger units of action, and in so doing must appear often at the beginning or end of Leo's acts; secondly, there is a notable predominance of entrance monologues, indicating a distinct preference for solo speech or song over dialogue in the technique of entrance; if one includes the *Zutrittsmonolog* and *Eintrittsmonolog* under the general term of entrance monologue, 60 per cent of the monologues of Roman comedy are entrance speeches, 20 per cent are exit monologues, and 20 per cent are link monologues.

It is, however, more illuminating to observe the variations in practice in individual plays. For here we see, what I am most eager to establish in opposition to current opinion, the absolute negation of any uniform procedure, and the consequent weakness of a view that Euripidean tragedy exerted a determining influence upon the form of comedy. Leo himself, on coming to the two Latin plays from the hand of Apollodorus, the *Phormio* and *Hecyra*, immediately recognizes a novel and individual technique; the *Phormio*, for example, has twelve monologues and five acts; but only one of the dozen solo speeches stands at the beginning or end of an act, and two-thirds of them are link monologues. The *Captivi*, he has to admit, only seemingly supports his theory; for two of its monologues are interlude scenes, and as such reveal another novel type of structure only partially paralleled by the *choragus* scene of the *Curculio;* that is, here clearly the monologue does not follow a vacant stage but occupies a stage which would otherwise be vacant; in other words, it performs one of the main functions of a chorus. Beyond these clear marks of variety and individuality lie equally clear evidences of divergence from any norm in other plays. What could be more suggestive than the contrast between the *Aulularia* and the *Asinaria?* The former is supposed by Leo to be Menandrian and is innocent of contamination; it has twenty-two monologues, an unusually large number, and four acts; yet of this large number of solo speeches only one stands at the beginning of an act, three at the ends of acts, and

no act is bracketed; and all this in spite of the fact that there are nine entrance and seven exit speeches out of the twenty-two. On the other hand, observe the *Asinaria*, from the Greek of an obscure poet, Demophilus; it has only six monologues, the smallest number of all the plays, and all six are used in the first half of the play, one at the beginning, two at the ends of acts. Possibly the plots of these two plays are peculiar and the structure correspondingly peculiar; but are we likely to appreciate properly the various theories of act division, of monologue, of Euripidean influence, until we consider how the plot and various other factors affect structure? Between the two extremes presented by these two plays the other comedies offer other interesting vagaries, into which I need not go at present.

In this discussion of the monologue I have necessarily accepted, for descriptive and argumentative purposes, the theory of vacant stages and of act division, although in the previous sections of the paper I have attacked the validity of the act theory, and of the vacant stage in Roman comedy as a criterion of division into acts. Perhaps I should state now my general attitude toward Leo's theories of the vacant stage, monologue, and act division. The broad implication in his discussion seems to me to be that a rather regular sequence of exit monologue, choral song, entrance monologue in choral drama (and specially in Euripides) results in Roman comedy in a fairly uniform sequence of exit monologue, vacant stage, entrance monologue.[1] Now I am perfectly willing to admit that the rôle of the Menandrian *komos*-chorus makes it likely that a Roman poet, finding such a chorus in his Greek original, would substitute for it a vacant stage, and monologues might often appear on either side of the *komos*-chorus and of the subsequent vacant stage. What I doubt is whether this Menandrian technique was consistently employed by Menander or by other Hellenistic poets, and whether Euripidean influence is a factor to be reckoned with when such technique appears.

---

[1] This statement is not quite fair to Leo. Exit monologues in Euripides are relatively few in number, and Leo would probably stress the fact that the sequence of choral song and entrance monologue in choral drama is replaced by the sequence of vacant stage and entrance monologue in Roman comedy. It is true that entrance monologue in Roman comedy is predominant, but from my standpoint the vacant stage before it is mere assumption in most cases. The sequence of exit monologue, vacant stage, and entrance monologue in Roman comedy occurs about 35 times out of a possible 104; eight plays have no examples of this sequence.

In my own mind I leave room for a further possibility that, much oftener than Leo admits (in the *Captivi* and *Curculio*), a monologue is itself a substitute for the chorus of choral drama, that it bridges gaps rather than follows a gap, that it promotes continuity of action even in the Greek original, as it does in my view, for example, in the *Persa* as a Roman production.[1]   From this standpoint possible vacant stages in Roman comedy are not very regularly substantial pauses, and monologues are sometimes surrogates of the vacant stage as well as of the chorus.   So far as Euripidean influence is concerned I see nothing in the evidence that conflicts with the view that, given racial psychology which prompts soliloquy, and granting the dramatic convenience of the monologue as an artifice in facilitating structure,[2] the monologue is bound to assert itself in comedy, without any Euripidean influence, as soon as the chorus is removed; this begins to appear at once in the *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus*, and if the *Helena* also illustrates it I see only the parallel development which I should expect in the two dramatic types.[3]

Euripidean influence is certainly not manifest in the spirit and general content of the comic monologue, and if its formal features are due to the tragic poet the mold has been usually filled with a content that comes either from the resources of Old comedy or from the immediate dramatic necessities of the New comedy of intrigue. The Euripidean monologue is limited in the main to prayers and

[1] Leo limits the technique to the passages referred to above, p. 116, n. 3.   Other passages which are *chorartig* (*Der Monolog*, 68, *Pl. Forsch*². 240, n. 1) in his opinion are of a different sort, being mainly *Lauscherscenen*.

[2] Cf. Arnold, *The Soliloquies of Shakespeare* (New York, 1911), 81, who indulges in the paradox that the structural monologues opening, closing, and linking chapters of action are artificial speeches used to avoid the appearance of artifice.   Similarly Roessler, *The Soliloquy in German Drama* (New York, 1915), 17, regards the structural monologue as a lubricant in the wheelwork of the drama.

[3] The point will be raised that Aeschylus and Sophocles do not use the Euripidean surrogates of the monologue.   In this, as in many other respects, Euripides and comedy are more or less alike, while the older tragedians differ.   Modern critics hastily use this situation to establish the influence of Euripides upon comedy.   But who knows, if there is any influence exerted at all, whether or not comedy as early as Epicharmus or as late as Aristophanes influenced Euripides?   Euripides and Old comedy have much in common: informality, direct appeal to the people, colloquial style, indifference to sophisticated art; Aristophanes criticizes Euripides because these and other features are out of place in tragedy; it would only be a pleasant irony if the tragic poet, from unconscious sympathy or conscious imitation, often approximated the style of comedy.

addresses to inanimate surroundings and to occasional pathetic
speeches over the heads of actors and chorus. Of the huge number
of comic monologues no general description is possible, but the
commonest types are narrative monologues outlining past, present,
and future action, and solo speeches on general aspects of social life.[1]
The former result largely from the dramatist's obligation to cover
offstage action or to make his plot intelligible; the latter, though
occasionally touching Euripidean themes,[2] are quite as much in the
spirit of the Aristophanic parabasis. Both types, and monologues in
general in comedy, are very often explicit or implicit addresses to the
audience[3] and as such reflect the informality of Old comedy; the
speeches to the chorus and to the audience in Aristophanes supply all
the needed literary background for the manner of delivery and for
some of the material of the comic monologue of the next centuries.[4]

VIII

In one type of expository monologue, however, modern critics
seem to have unassailable evidence of the closest interrelation between
Hellenistic comedy and Euripides. The Plautine prologue that nar-
rates the plot in a detachable speech to the audience delivered by a
divinity, or a character in the play, or a "prologus," is generally
admitted to reproduce all the essential features of the Euripidean
prologue. This evidence I have no desire to minimize, but I may
properly indicate by a few brief comments that the antecedents of
the Plautine prologue are mixed rather than simple, as is so often
the case with phenomena in which modern criticism stresses heav-
ily the Euripidean features.

The prologue is only one form of exposition, or only part of the
exposition. At the outset I find it significant that another type of
exposition, in which a dialogue between master and slave opens the
play, and the master in response to urgent questions discloses facts
of interest to the audience, is admitted by the chief essayist on the

[1] For examples, cf. Leo, *Der Monolog*, 72, nn. 13 and 14.

[2] Cf., e.g., Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], 119; for the philosophizing as such cf. *CP*, XIII
(1918), 134–37.

[3] Leo, *Der Monolog*, 80; Schaffner, *De aversum loquendi ratione* (Giessen, 1911), 18.

[4] Leo, *Der Monolog*, 79 ff., *Geschichte d. röm. Lit.*, I, 107, 109, n. 1.

prologues of Greek comedy not only to have distinctly mixed ante-
cedents but to owe its origin to comedy rather than to tragedy;[1] and
this too in spite of the closest resemblance in details of phraseology
as well as of general situation between such dialogue expositions in
the Roman plays and the corresponding expositions of Euripidean
tragedy: ". . . . videntur mihi talia initia ut Thesmophoriazusarum
Pluti Iphigeniae Aul. Pseudoli Curculionis primum ficta esse a poetis
comicis, inde autem manasse et per tragoediam et per mediam novam-
que comoediam."[2] Without intending at all to subscribe to any
theory of origins in this matter,[3] I quote this statement of Frantz
simply to suggest that in the triangular relation which is often ap-
parent between Aristophanes, Euripides, and New comedy one must
be open-minded to the possibility that early comedy rather than
Euripides is the initiating force, and that Euripidean influence is only
one of many strands in the complicated phenomenon of later comedy.

It is this same triangular relation that confronts a student of the
prologue as a detachable speech to the audience, if he is not biased
by preconceptions of Euripides' influence upon later comedy. A
discriminating critic like Leo[4] may successfully trace in the Euripidean
prologues a development from a speech in which the expositor care-
fully accounts in the prologue for his appearance, justifies the solilo-
quy form of his address, and in general satisfies all the demands of a
modern sophisticated critic, to a negligent and relatively inartistic
prologue in which the speaker seems to be almost impersonal,
disregards motivation, external or internal, and is conscious of
the audience, though he does not directly appeal to it.[5] And the

[1] Frantz, *De comoediae Att. prologis* (1891), 21 ff. He is quite convinced, however,
that the prologue as a detachable expository speech is thoroughly Euripidean (*ibid.*,
30 ff., 40, 45, 49).

[2] *Ibid.*, 28.

[3] In this small matter I should probably not espouse any theory of origins or
influence but content myself with the observation that comic and tragic dramatists,
facing similar problems of exposition, solve the difficulties in similar simple ways. The
modern playwright who opens his play with a dialogue between the butler and the maid
need not have read ancient drama or contemporary drama; such devices are quickly
conventionalized, of course, and become traditional, but they are weak props for any
thoroughgoing theory of origins or influence.

[4] *Der Monolog*, 14–26.

[5] Explicit address to the audience in tragedy is so rare that Frantz (*op. cit.*, 50)
properly describes it as a descent to the plane of comedy.

conclusion is that in this final type of Euripidean prologue "der 'prologus' der späteren Komödie ist . . . . potentiell vorhanden."[1] Over against this fact must be balanced the equally significant conditions in Aristophanes' *Knights* and *Wasps* and *Peace* (cf. *Birds*, 30 ff.), which critics cannot refer to Euripidean tragedy at all; in these plays one of two slaves, after some preliminary dialogue, turns to the audience and in frankly informal address to the spectators expounds the theme or general situation.[2] Here is a much clearer background for the inartistic comic prologue of later times; nor can one deny that the interruption, in the Plautine prologues, of the exposition of the plot by facetious remarks and serious reflections (as, for example, in the *Captivi*) for the benefit of the audience is quite alien to Euripides and entirely in accord with the spirit of Old comedy. It is, however, quite clear that the monologue form of detachable exposition in New comedy is more closely allied to Euripidean technique than, for example, to the monologue of Dicaeopolis at the beginning of the *Acharnians;* and one may easily see how the travestying of tragedies would have brought over the Euripidean monologue into Middle comedy, and how readily the same expository form would have been retained in the comedy of manners. At the same time one must admit that the extreme informality, the frankness of direct address to the spectators, the conscious exposition of the plot, are all forestalled in Aristophanic comedy. In such matters Euripides may be not an initiating force but a complacent victim to the democratic informality of early comedy.

Not only as relatively inorganic solo speech is the prologue in Hellenistic and Roman comedy traced to Euripides, but in the choice of persons as speakers comedy is supposed to be following closely the tragic poet. For in Euripides the prologues are delivered by char-

---

[1] *Der Monolog*, 25.

[2] Leo, of course, recognizes the contribution of Old comedy in this respect (*Der Monolog*, 80), but his general appraisal puts all the emphasis upon the Euripidean prologue. Beyer, *De scaenis . . . . quibus . . . . narrantur, non aguntur* (Göttingen, 1912), 49, asserting that this Aristophanic form of exposition is primitive and was established in comedy much earlier, strangely argues that it is derived from tragedy. It may be observed that, so far as this expository address to the audience in Aristophanes follows preliminary dialogue, it furnishes a better background for the intercalated prologue of Plautine comedy than, I think, anything that Euripides has to offer.

acters in the play or by divinities; and the extant prologues of
comedy are put in the mouths of the same two types of speakers;
comedy, to be sure, has added to the list the impersonal "prologus,"
whom modern critics dismiss as a natural final development of the
inorganic prologue.[1] In this bit of cumulative evidence, however,
there is a deviation from complete correspondence that might prove
significant of a different history for the expository prologue. The
divinities who deliver the Euripidean prologues are, almost without
exception, the major gods and goddesses of the hierarchy.[2] The
divine beings who serve as prologists in comedy are of a different
and lower order. It is at least incautious to speak of "die direkte
Abkunft"[3] (from the prologizing divinities in tragedy) of such
allegorical figures as Aer, Elenchos, Agnoia, Auxilium, Luxuria,
Inopia, Tuche, and Phobos, and of minor deities like Arcturus, Heros,
and Lar Familiaris. The consistency of allegorical prologists in
comedy is striking. One may argue, of course, that the less heroic
material of New comedy naturally make unavailable as prologists
such divinities as Aphrodite, Artemis, Apollo, and the like, and that
allegorical figures are a natural substitute for the Euripidean pro-
logists. On the other hand, there seems to be no special reason why
Venus should not utter the prologue of many a comedy in which the
love story is prominent, or why Neptune as well as Arcturus might
not introduce the *Rudens*, if with consequent loss of the charming
detail in the present prologue; but this does not happen, so far as we
can discover from extant material.[4] That Kalligeneia, who seems
to have spoken an expository monologue at the beginning of Aris-
tophanes' second *Thesmophoriazusae*, or Dorpia, who perhaps simi-
larly introduced Philyllius' *Herakles*, is a perfect background for the
allegorical prologists of later comedy is not quite certain; these
deities were probably personifications of festival days, and as such
approximate the divine prologists of New comedy; they may,
however, have had active rôles in the plays, and the *Herakles* may

[1] Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*[2], 224 ff.

[2] The case of Thanatos in the *Alcestis* is hardly a real exception.

[3] Leo, *op. cit.*, 212.

[4] Dionysus in the Strassburg prologue is far from certain, nor are Eros and Aphro-
dite in the Ghorân papyri valid exceptions. For other possible cases of comic pro-
logists cf. Leo, *op cit.*, 212, n. 4.

have been a mythological travesty.   But even if Old comedy had no
prologists of precisely the same type as New comedy, it should be
clear that the allegorical figures of Ploutos, Opora, Theoria, Eirene,
the Logos Dikaios and Logos Adikos, which issue naturally from the
fantastic plots of Aristophanic comedy, suggest that the allegorical
prologists of New comedy, as allegorical figures, are not primarily
Euripidean at all;[1] nor should anybody overlook in this connection
the rôles of Earth and Sea, of Logos and Logina, in Epicharmus.
The part that Sicilian-Attic comedy and very early mythological
travesty of epic story and oral legend played in this development
both of allegorical figures and of the prologue is unknown, but con-
servative criticism will reckon with the unknown, at least so far as
to modify hasty conclusions from the known.[2]

<center>IX</center>

It would strengthen the contention of modern critics appreciably
if, through careful analysis of the structure of action in New comedy
and of the mainsprings of action, they had established close con-
nections with Euripidean tragedy.   Legrand in his *Daos* (p. 383),
having asserted that the rigorous unity of later comedy is due to the
influence of tragedy, remarks that he will, in the course of subsequent
chapters, repeatedly note that the comedies employed the same
motives or adopted the same general arrangement as did the dramas
of Euripides; yet in his immediately following discussion of simple
and intricate plots and of "les ressorts de l'action" there is not a
single reference to any Euripidean parallels.   In various particu-
larities of dramatic technique, however, Legrand and others do find
further evidence of Euripidean influence.   Some representative
instances of such discussions I must briefly consider.

---

[1] The nearest approach to such figures in Euripides is in the prelude to the second
part of the *Hercules furens*, in which *Lussa*, conducted by Iris, enters the palace some-
what as Inopia is escorted by Luxuria to the house of the hero in the prologue of the
Trinummus.   I should be quite willing to grant that Philemon might have been
influenced by Euripides here, without admitting that the isolated instance in Euripides
is sufficient to explain the extensive use of allegorical prologists in comedy.

[2] It is pertinent to remark that the call for applause at the end of the play has a
background in Aristophanes; cf. Leo, *op. cit.*, 240 and n. 3.   And it is not uninteresting
to observe that Leo is mistaken (*ibid.*, 241) in thinking that the quotation of a similar
tag in Suetonius (*Aug.* 99) is from Middle or New comedy; is it not clearly implied
to come from a mime?

A characteristic of most of these studies in the minutiae of dramatic technique is the acceptance, at the start, of the Euripidean theory; the writers then proceed to find cumulative evidence of the dependence of comedy upon tragedy in whatever detail of craftsmanship they choose for investigation. Thus, for example, Fraenkel opens a chapter of his study with the statement: "id effectum est ut hodie paene iam pueris decantatum sit ex quinti saeculi tragoedia, Euripidea imprimis, in mediam novamque comoediam non modo varia fabularum argumenta . . . . sed etiam singulas sententias . . . . defluxisse";[1] and Harms begins his essay on motivation: "constat novam . . . . comoediam potius tragoediae Euripideae quam veteris comoediae forman atque rationem secutam esse."[2] Considering the vogue of the theory that Euripides is "der wahre Begründer der neueren attischen Komödie," one can hardly blame such writers, but the danger in starting from this theory as a demonstrated fact is obvious. Nor are the methods employed in the course of investigation as sound as they should be. Constantly one finds the writers of dissertations observing that A resembles B, and that therefore B is derived from A; that both A and B may be derived from X, or that for other reasons the resemblance of A to B does not establish any causal connection between the two, never enters into their calculations. In general, having recognized the possibility of Euripidean influence, they never stop to eliminate all other possibilities. Practically such investigations are brought to a conclusion at the point where fruitful study might well begin.

I can easily sympathize, for example, with anybody who, in reading the *Alcestis* of Euripides, remarks[3] that "der gastfreundliche Herr, die aufopferungswillige Gattin, der treue, etwas beschränkte Diener, der böse, senile Älte" can easily be paralleled from Menander and Plautus. But if this stereotyping tendency in Euripides is a natural issue from the technique of the *Märchen*, and if in

[1] Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia qu. sel.* (Göttingen, 1912), 53.

[2] Harms, *De introitu personarum in Euripidis et novae comoediae fab.* (Göttingen, 1914), 1.

[3] Howald, *Untersuch. zur Technik der euripid. Trag.* (Tübingen, 1914), 19. Howald does not use the resemblance to prove any interrelation, and I quote his words only to illustrate a natural and current impression of the likeness between Euripides and comedy in the matter of characters.

Aristophanes I find Socrates approximating a typical philosopher rather than the real Socrates, and if Aristophanes and Doric farce already have developed, without Euripidean influence, stereotyped professional rôles, I must conclude that the degree of Euripidean influence upon New comedy in this respect is difficult to determine; certainly I cannot lay much weight on the fact that Aristophanes does not stereotype domestic rôles as long as he has little occasion to use them.   And I must remain open-minded to the possibility that the resemblance of Euripides to New comedy does not establish any interdependence of the one and the other.   For aught I know Sicilian-Attic comedy may have had stereotyped domestic rôles before Euripides wrote tragedy.   I am not denying that some comic poets learned something about character treatment from Euripides, directly or indirectly, but again the whole problem is a complex, not a simple, one.

The so-called unities of time and place in drama have been studied, and various observations have been made regarding the devices used by dramatists to preserve these unities.   The recent history of such studies is significant.   Felsch[1] records the artifices used by Greek tragedians.   Polczyk[2] follows with a study of the same problems in New comedy and notes in connection with almost every artifice that Felsch has found the same device in Greek tragedy; Polcyzk then concludes that in these respects New comedy is dependent upon tragedy.   Almost immediately, however, Todd, in studying the unity of time in Aristophanes, avows that Old comedy uses the same devices as New comedy, a fact which Polcyzk had denied.[3] If Todd is right we are confronted with a dilemma: Did Euripides teach Aristophanes these artifices?   Or did Aristophanes, Euripides, and poets of the New comedy, facing the same problem, solve it in the same way independently of one another?

That the second of these two alternatives must be chosen seems to me likely when we are concerned with particularities of technique that are clearly due to conditions of the Greek theater, in which Euripides and poets of the Old and the New comedy produced their

---

[1] *Bresl. Philol. Abhandl.*, IX (1907), Heft 4.

[2] Polczyk, *De unitatibus et loci et temporis in nov. com. obs.* (Breslau, 1909).

[3] Todd, *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XXIV (1915), 50 ff.

plays.   A rigid scenic background and an essentially outdoor setting were conditions that faced Euripides and the comic poets; resemblances between tragedy and comedy, therefore, in artifices which manifestly result from a common interest in overcoming these and similar difficulties cannot be used to establish the dependence of comedy upon tragedy, especially when the devices are of a simple and obvious nature.   So in the mass of conventions relating to the *mise en scène* which Legrand accumulates on pages 428–63 of his *Daos*, nobody should look for any evidence of the interrelation of the two literary types; nor does Legrand venture beyond the wise statement (p. 461) that the germs of these conventions are found both in Aristophanes and in Euripides.   Other critics rashly jump to conclusions; even if Polczyk is right in denying that Aristophanes preserves unity of place by the same devices as Euripides and New comedy, it is hazardous for him to argue from the resemblance in this respect between the tragic poet and later comic poets that New comedy took over these conventions from tragedy.

It is of course natural, when Aristophanes differs in his procedure, and Euripides and New comedy agree, to infer a close historical relation between tragedy and New comedy.   Even this inference is unsafe if, as is the case, tragedy and later comedy have in common but quite independently of each other domestic plots and broadly emotional incidents which Aristophanes does not employ.   Thus, for example, Harms[1] in his study of motivation observes that the entrance of characters upon the stage in Euripides and in New comedy is often motivated "aut dolore aut inquiete animi aut consideratione," whereas in Aristophanes such emotional and mental conditions are not generally employed to make the entrance of characters natural and inevitable; for this and other reasons Harms concludes that New comedy takes over from Euripides its devices for motivating entrance.   But when such resemblances are pointed out one should first consider whether the common element may not be accounted for without any dependence of one type upon the other.   Aristophanic comedy, in the nature of the case, does not stress the emotional side of life; Euripides and New comedy, on the contrary, are dealing with the emotional experiences of everyday people and

[1] *Op. cit.,* 64.

will naturally motivate action by elementary emotions to a very
large degree without necessarily being interdependent in that respect.

Harms, and others in similar studies, apparently strengthen their
arguments by pointing out corroborating resemblances in details of
phraseology and style.   This procedure is in itself quite legitimate,
but again the critics are hasty in their inferences.   In the first place,
some stylistic features which Euripides cultivates became common
property of writers in the Hellenistic period and may appear in New
comedy without any direct influence of the tragic poet.   Again
many details of form and turns of phrase may recur in both types of
literature, because they are taken by each type, independently of the
other, from the common fund of colloquial expression which
Euripides, somewhat abnormally, and comedy, quite naturally,
delight to use, or from some other common source.   When Harms,[1]
for example, discovers that the Phrygian in *Orestes* 1375 justifies his
entrance by revealing fear in the words, "Woe's me; whither shall
I flee?" and that Bromia in the *Amphitruo* similarly exclaims, "me
miseram, quid agam nescio?" and Myrrhina in the *Hecyra*, "perii,
quid agam? quo me vortam?" the resemblance in these emotional
commonplaces between Euripides and New comedy moves me about
as much as would the discovery that Harms and I had made the same
blunder; without imitating him I am quite capable of it.   Each of
these details is trivial in itself, but the discussion of them so pervades
the treatment of comedy in these days that I may be allowed another
concrete example.   Fraenkel[2] discovers the following feature in both
Euripidean tragedy and later comedy: Two interlocutors in a
dialogue scene are engaged in expounding a situation or facts; one
of them, A, is telling the story, but instead of setting it forth in an
unbroken sequence he interrupts himself and turns to the other
interlocutor, B, and says, "Do you know so-and-so?"   B answers,
"Of course I do," and there follows a brief conversation on this line,
after which A resumes his narrative.   Now this simple bit of dialogue
technique Fraenkel offers as proof of the dependence of comedy upon
Euripides, although he says incidentally, "sane e cottidiani sermonis
consuetudine mutuatus."   Naturally I wonder how he knows that

[1] *Op. cit.*, 29 ff.
[2] *Op. cit.*, 54 ff.

Euripides and any comic poet did not independently draw upon the material of ordinary speech for this device; and I wonder too just how any dramatic poet who prefers dialogue to monologue can manage a bit of expository narrative without some such commonplace device by which the other person in the scene may be drawn into the conversation.

Briefly then, in these particularities of technique modern criticism stops short at the simple equation of resemblance with dependence. But to establish dependence something more must be discovered than simple devices to meet conditions, external or internal, that are common to both types of drama and result either from production in the same sort of theater with similar peculiarities of scene setting, or from the use of similar pathetic material.

X

The force of these modern tendencies has led us to view Roman comedy as a *Kunst*, either quite disregarding farcical and burlesque elements and inorganic structure, or dismissing them as Roman intrusions in the artistic fabric woven under Euripidean influence. We need feel under no obligation to demolish this theory of Euripidean influence; least of all need we set up an opposing theory. But, as often in the study of literary genesis, a confession of ignorance is a wholesome preliminary to the discovery of sound methods and of helpful results.   Surely we must admit that the direct and indirect literary antecedents of Hellenistic comedy include a number of totally unknown factors.   There is the transitional period of Middle comedy, represented only by fragments; there is Sicilian-Attic comedy, of whose form and content we are quite ignorant; there are, possibly, subsidiary factors, like the mime and fictitious narrative in prose, which are chiefly known to us now only as they were developed in centuries later even than the period of New comedy.   Such conditions should promote a conservative attitude toward any theorizing. It is very tempting to seize upon the known extant material of Euripides and Plautus and Terence and to construct a theory of dependence that disregards the unknown.

Some degree of substantial dependence upon Euripides in particular and tragedy in general is made probable by the cultivation of

mythological travesty in the Middle period. The general proba-
bility, however, and the degree of dependence are very difficult to
determine, in view of the loss of comedies from the transitional
period, and must be qualified by two known facts: (1) that such
mythological travesty is much earlier than the Middle period and
dates back even to a time when epic and oral tradition of myth may
have been the subjects of travesty; and (2) that Aristotle seems to
have found in Sicilian-Attic comedy rather than in Aristophanes or
Euripides the antecedents of the comedy of his own day. In addition
to the indirect influence of tragedy through mythological travesty
there is a more palpable and immediate impact of tragedy upon a few
individual poets, notably Menander and Philemon; yet the general
character and degree of such influence hardly warrants a careful
critic in demanding even of Menander and Philemon a regular
conformity to supposed canons of Euripidean art. And at least the
current assumption that Hellenistic comedy as a whole was monoto-
nously regular and uniformly artistic deserves a thorough overhauling.

Mere comparison of Euripides and New comedy may lead to
deceptive results. Currents of thought that are abnormal in the
time of Euripides become commonplace in the next century; demo-
cratic informality that sets Euripides apart from Aeschylus and
Sophocles is an inherent quality of all comedy in Greece; prosaic and
colloquial idioms that are idiosyncrasies in the tragic poet are the
natural stock in trade of comedy; the material of later comedy
is pathetic, as, independently, are the incidents of tragedy; and,
finally, tragedy and comedy were produced under roughly the same
external conditions. Naturally, therefore, there will be resemblances,
but only after careful study may we accept them as evidence of any
direct influence of tragedy upon comedy. Like many other types of
literature in the Hellenistic period, comedy marks the confluence of
many different streams, the crisscrossing of various earlier types, the
constant fusion of contemporary realistic experience with themes
and incidents conventionalized by a conservative literary tradition.

A frank recognition of the complicated phenomenon would save
us from the dangerous use of simple universal solvents. Our present
practice, based on the Euripidean theory, is treacherously easy. We
measure all the plays of Plautus and Terence by the standard of

Menander's *Epitrepontes*[1] and assume a uniform procedure in all the Greek authors of the originals which Plautus and Terence adapted, blinding ourselves to the manifest variety in the twenty-six Latin plays.   With supposed canons of Euripidean art as a basis we note the inartistic and attribute it to Roman handling, disregarding both the fact that the whole history of Greek comedy naturalizes inartistic irregularities and the likelihood that the tradition of the Latin texts through the hands of stage managers offered every opportunity for excision, substitution, and displacement.

What little we know and the large amount of what we do not know should lead us to approach the higher criticism of Roman comedy with caution and in a somewhat pessimistic temper.   But there is one condition that prompts a mildly optimistic outlook. Twenty-six plays constitute a considerable mass of material.   Should it not be possible, disregarding all theories, to analyze these plays, placing side by side like features, discriminating the unlike, and thereby ultimately obtaining a helpful synthesis which might lead to sounder constructive interpretation?   Legrand, in his *Daos*, has made a notable attempt to co-ordinate some important facts, but many problems remain either untouched or, if handled at all, only blurred by the shadow of the Euripidean theory.   The results would not be startling;   many difficulties would remain unsolved;   the neatness and despatch of recent dissection, which removes the excrescences of Roman botchwork from the sound body of Euripidean *Kunst*, would be wanting;   but we should at least be starting from a very proper confession of ignorance instead of from a mere theory that is supported, in large part though not wholly, by various weak hypotheses.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Cf. Wilamowitz, *Sitzb. der. berlin. Akad.* (1911), 485.

SOME TESTS OF THE RELATIVE ANTIQUITY OF HOMERIC BOOKS

By John A. Scott

I. AN AEOLIC INFINITIVE BEFORE THE BUCOLIC DIERESIS

It is agreed that if there be an unanswerable argument for dividing the Homeric poems into different strata this argument is not to be found in the poetry as poetry but in the test of language. Men who have judged Homer merely as poetry have had no standing in the supreme court of criticism, for in this court language holds the final decision. Jebb's *Homer*, page 117, says "Poets regard the Homeric poems as a unity; critics favor manifold authorship."

No test seems to me more convincing than the test of the Aeolic infinitive in -ἐμεν. This is clearly an archaic survival even in Homer and, as Witte has shown in his article on the Homeric language in Pauly-Wissowa, *sub voce* "Homeros," p. 2217, this infinitive is not found in Ionic-Attic, Homeric poetry having inherited it from earlier songs. Witte, following Bekker, shows that the Homeric verse has a peculiarly conservative influence just before the bucolic dieresis, and that it is just because of such a conservative influence that this infinitive is preserved at all, for he asserts, p. 2245, that it is never found in any other part of the verse, "Altertümliche Formen, die sich nur vor der bukolischen Diärese finden, sind z. B. die Infinitive auf -ἐμεν." This is an astounding error from one who assumes to be an expert in this particular field, as these few examples selected from many will show.

A 443 παῖδά τε σοὶ ἀγέμεν, Φοίβῳ θ' ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην.

α   79 ἀθανάτων ἀέκητι θεῶν ἐριδαινέμεν οἶος.

β 305 ἀλλά μοι ἐσθιέμεν καὶ πινέμεν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.

This is simply an error and has no bearing on the question of Homeric authorship. This archaic infinitive does however furnish an important test for deciding the various Homeric strata and has been repeatedly so used; Witte says, in the article already cited, p. 2217: "I. Bekker, Homerische Blätter I, 147, hat beobachtet dass die Ilias im vierten Fuss 116 und die Odyssee 51 Infinitive auf

-ἔμεν aufweist." The difference here can hardly be explained by difference in theme, and it must be admitted that the poet of the Odyssey has revealed his comparative lateness by his greatly restricted use of this archaic and important infinitive, if the above-mentioned figures are correct.

Bekker is accurately quoted by Witte and the latter scholar is thus absolved from any responsibility for the figures, and he is justified in emphasizing the importance of this chorizontic argument.

Bekker is known as one of the outstanding Homeric scholars of the last century, and as he is also the editor of one of the most illustrious recensions of the complete text of Homer we are thus able to test his figures in the readings of his own text.

His statistics for the *Iliad* are substantially correct, since in reading the *Iliad* in search of these infinitives I found 114, as compared with his 116, so that I conclude that I have overlooked two and that we both have used the same method in counting, but in making a like search in his own edition of the *Odyssey* I found, not his fifty-one, but I actually found seventy, so that while his figures for the *Iliad* are essentially correct those in the *Odyssey* must be increased nearly forty per cent.

Inasmuch as the *Iliad* has 3583 more verses than the *Odyssey*, the seventy examples in the *Odyssey* show little relative decline when compared with the 116 of the longer poem.

That it may be easy for anyone to test the reliability of these statistics for the *Odyssey*, a complete list, as found in the edition of Bekker, is here given; α 91, 370, 392; β 60, 207, 244, 305, 370; γ 89, 93, 188, 237, 336; δ 29, 94, 139, 171, 210, 215, 473, 708; ε 99, 112; ζ 28, 257, 304, 327; η 109, 220; θ 223, 237; ι 3, 101, 494; κ 73; λ 315, 442, 475; μ 49, 160; ν 395; ξ 491; ο 21, 393, 543; π 152, 278, 422; ρ 56, 81, 106, 520; σ 3, 127, 357, 371; τ 25, 64, 191, 316, 533; υ 294; φ 69, 195, 312, 399; χ 288; ψ 355; ω 307, 457; total, 70. In these figures no infinitive in -ἔμεν is counted unless it comes directly before the bucolic dieresis. I should have preferred to have compared all the infinitives of this formation, wherever they are found in the verse, but as Bekker chose to limit his investigation to this single position, I have no choice except to follow him. However, the value of this scrutiny is hardly less from the fact that it is not all-inclusive.

This test is so important and its conclusions so valid that it can confidently be applied, not only to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as wholes, but to the various assumed strata.   The first four books of the *Iliad* have about 2,500 verses and they have sixteen examples of this archaic infinitive before the bucolic dieresis; while the first four books of the *Odyssey* have about 2,200 verses, yet they have twenty-one of these infinitives. Hence by this test of language the despised *Telemacheia* is older than the first four books of the *Iliad*.

By this same test *Iliad* xxii, the core of the Ur-Ilias, with but one example of this infinitive, is extremely late, whereas x, the discredited Doloneia, with seven, xxiii with eight, and xxiv with six, are all early. No book in either poem is without this infinitive, *Iliad* xx and xxii have one each, and x, xiv, xx, and xxii of the *Odyssey* have a like number, while book iv of the *Odyssey* has eight, the other extreme, and likewise xv and xxiii of the *Iliad*.   The average for the *Odyssey* is about three to each book, while the longer books of the *Iliad* average over four.

The poet of the *Odyssey* did not rely on the *Iliad* for these archaic forms, but freely employed or formed infinitives in -έμεν which are not found in the earlier poem.   A partial list of such infinitives not used in the *Iliad* but found in the *Odyssey*, just before the bucolic dieresis, will show that the poet of the *Odyssey* was not borrowing from nor dependent on the *Iliad; ἀλαλκέμεν, ἀτεμβέμεν, βασιλευέμεν, βλωσκέμεν, βουλευέμεν, γηρασκέμεν, εἰδησέμεν, θαασέμεν, θητευέμεν, κομιζέμεν, ὀφελλέμεν, παλαζέμεν, πασχέμεν, πιφαυσκέμεν, ῥαπτέμεν.*

When we compare the usage of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, in the matter of this old infinitive formation, as found in the fourth foot, with that of the Homeric Hymns we find the greatest contrast, since the first seven Homeric Hymns with over two thousand verses have but two examples, iii. 68, and iv. 172.   Five of these seven greatest Homeric Hymns thus have no examples, and the average for the seven is one to each thousand verses, while the first two thousand verses of the *Odyssey* have twenty, that is, one to each one hundred verses.

Evidently this form was but a learned survival in the age when the Homeric Hymns were created, and many years must have separated these poems from the era which produced the *Iliad* and

the *Odyssey*, while the identical treatment as revealed in these two great poems assigns them to a single epoch.

No artifice ever produced such similarity of usage, and this unconscious agreement can be explained on no other hypothesis than on that of identity of origin.

II. THE ADJECTIVAL USE OF οὐδέν

Jebb in his *Homer*, page 188, under the heading "Differences between the language of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," presented the following paragraph; "In the *Iliad* οὐδέν is used as an adverb, 'not at all,' or as a substantive, 'nothing'; in the *Odyssey* it is used also as an adjective οὐδὲν ἔπος, δ 350, etc., and so once in the *Iliad*, Κ 216." One would suppose from the argument and the use of "etc." that this adjectival use in the *Odyssey* must be very general, but in reality the verse cited by him is the only verse in the entire poem which can be made, even by a forced interpretation, to illustrate the rule.

The clearness and simplicity of οὐδὲν ἔπος can find no parallel when the full passage is read, for the verse is,

> δ 350:   τῶν οὐδέν τοι ἐγὼ κρύψω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.

This is a typical verse in which the sense is found in the words before the caesura in the fourth foot, and the rest of the verse is a tag which repeats the idea already expressed; "Of these I will conceal nothing from you," and then the tag, "neither will I hide a word." The noun seems to me an afterthought, and the negative is too remote to have any genuine adjectival feeling. It takes careful handling and a little pressure to make an adjective out of οὐδέν in this verse, yet this is the only example of the construction which is assumed to be a distinguishing mark of the *Odyssey*.

Jebb is right in saying that Κ 216 is an example of this use, but he is wrong in saying it is the only example, for he has overlooked one of great importance in Χ 518, οὐδὲν σοίγ' ὄφελος. "No benefit to thee." These words are in the scene in which Andromache laments the fact that Hector is to have no benefit from the costly raiment she is about to burn for him. The negative and the noun go easily together, and all the editors whom I have consulted agree with Faesi, who translates it, "Für dich kein Gewinn."

There are two reasonably certain examples of this adjectival use in Homer; neither is in the *Odyssey*, but both are in the *Iliad*.

It is worth noting that one of these examples is in K and the other in X, another slight indication of the unity of authorship of the Doloneia and the Death of Hector.

If it be granted that the negative has an adjectival force in the one passage in the *Odyssey*, even this admission would be but a feeble justification for the argument quoted above.

III. HIATUS IN THE BUCOLIC DIERESIS

Professor Jebb, in arraying the main arguments for assigning the Homeric poems to different ages and authors, lays especial emphasis on the difference existing between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the matter of the hiatus in the bucolic dieresis; Jebb's *Homer*, page 139 in the fifth edition: "Hiatus in the bucolic dieresis is about twice as frequent in the *Odyssey* as in the *Iliad*. Books xxiii and xxiv of the *Iliad* show an affinity with the *Odyssey* in this metrical point. Monro, *Gr.*, ¶382." I shall take up the discussion of Monro later in this article.

There are three kinds of hiatus in Homer: apparent hiatus, partial hiatus, and real hiatus. Real hiatus is generally spoken of as hiatus without the adjective "real." Apparent hiatus is found in those places where the Vulgate shows a hiatus, but where originally a consonant intervened between the two vowels, as in such a verse as A 4, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια, where the final short vowel of δὲ is not elided before an initial vowel, because the next word formerly began with a digamma. The hiatus is thus only apparent, a matter of printing or editing, and there is no defect in the meter. Such words are freely used in all parts of Homer.

Partial hiatus is found in those verses where a diphthong or a long vowel is scanned as short before a following initial vowel or diphthong, as in such a verse as A 14, ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος, where the final diphthong is scanned as short before the initial vowel. Examples of partial hiatus are on every page, and sometimes two or more in a single verse, as in A 299, οὔτε σοὶ οὔτε τῳ ἄλλῳ, ἐπεί κτλ, where partial hiatus is found in three consecutive feet. This form of hiatus, like the other, seems to have presented no feeling of discord either to the poet or to his hearers.

Genuine hiatus is confined to those passages in which a short final vowel is not elided, or in which a long vowel or a diphthong is not shortened metrically before another word with an initial vowel. Such a hiatus is rare in all parts of Homer, but long vowels and diphthongs in hiatus may sometimes retain their full quantity under the ictus, also occasionally before pauses in the verse, such as at the caesura or at the bucolic dieresis; also short vowels sometimes permit hiatus at these pauses.

This paper concerns itself solely with genuine hiatus at the bucolic dieresis, and the use of the word "hiatus" is to be understood in that restricted sense.

The examples of this hiatus are as follows; the text is Ludwich's:

A 578: Διί, ὄφρα μή αὖτε
B   6: Ἀγαμέμνονι οὖλον ὄνειρον·
B 231: ἀγάγω ἢ ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν,
B 397: ἔνθ' ἢ ἔνθα γένωνται,
          (There is no example of this hiatus in the Catalogue of the Ships.)
Δ 138: πρὸ δὲ εἴσατο καὶ τῆς.
E 50: ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι,
E 221: ἐπιβήσεο, ὄφρα ἴδηαι
E 538: πρὸ δὲ εἴσατο χαλκός,
E 568: ἔγχεα ὀξυόεντα
H 11: ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι
Θ 105: ἐπιβήσεο, ὄφρα ἴδηαι
Θ 514: ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι
I 690: κατελέξατο· ὡς γὰρ ἀνώγει,
K 93: περιδείδια, οὐδέ μοι ἦτορ
K 472: κέκλιτο, εὖ κατὰ κόσμον,
Λ 84: δέξατο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ
Λ 554: τάς τε τρεῖ ἐσσύμενός περ·
M 320: μελιηδέα· ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ ἷς
Ξ 130: ἕλκει ἕλκος ἄρηται·
O 161: θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἅλα δῖαν.
O 177: θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἅλα δῖαν.
O 271: κεραὸν ἢ ἄγριον αἶγα
O 742: ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι.
P 368: ἔπι ὅσσοι ἄριστοι
P 663: τε τρεῖ ἐσσύμενός περ·
Υ 170: ἰσχία ἀμφοτέρωθεν
Φ 234: ἐπέσσυτο οἴδματι θύων
Ψ 224: ὀδύρετο ὀστέα καίων,
Ψ 465: ἡνία, οὐδὲ δυνάσθη
Ω 207: ὅδε, οὔ σ' ἐλεήσει

B   3: φρένα, ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
B 218: συνοχωκότε· αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε
B 262: αἰδῶ ἀμφικαλύπτει,

Γ 24: κεραὸν ἢ ἄγριον αἶγα,
Δ 410: ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ.
E 215: φαεινῷ ἐν πυρὶ θείην.
E 484: Ἀχαιοὶ ἢ κεν ἄγοιεν·
E 542: τε Ὀρσίλοχόν τε.
Z 422: ἤματι Ἄιδος εἴσω·
Θ 66: ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ
Θ 120: Θηβαίου, Ἠνιοπῆα,
I 238: Διί, οὐδέ τι τίει
K 70: πονεώμεθα· ὡδέ που ἄμμι
K 351: ἐπὶ οὖρα πέλονται
Λ 76: καθείατο, ἧχι ἑκάστῳ
Λ 461: ἀνεχάζετο, αὖε δ' ἑταίρους.
Λ 791: δαίφρονι, αἴ κε πίθηται.
N 584: ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι.
O 23: βηλοῦ, ὄφρ' ἂν ἵκηται
O 172: διέπτατο ὠκέα Ἶρις,
O 232: μέγα ὄφρ' ἂν Ἀχαιοὶ
O 536: ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι.
Π 226: αὐτοῦ αἴθοπα οἶνον.
P 518: πρὸ δὲ εἴσατο χαλκός.
Υ 22: πτυχὶ Οὐλύμποιο
Φ 111: δείλη ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ
Ψ 195: ὑπέσχετο ἱερὰ καλά.
Ψ 441: ὅρκου οἴσῃ ἀέθλον.
Ω 72: Ἕκτορα ἢ γάρ οἱ αἰεί
Ω 641: πασάμην, καὶ αἴθοπα οἶνον.

That is, the *Iliad* has sixty reasonably certain examples of hiatus at
the bucolic diaeresis, and there is one other given in the Teubner Text
and in the Ameis-Hentze edition, Σ 128 ἐτήτυμα, οὐ κτλ. ἐτήτυμον
however is the reading given by Ludwich and Leaf.

The following examples are from the *Odyssey:*

α	60:	Ὀλύμπιε. οὐ νύ τ' Ὀδυσσεύς	α	61:	χαρίζετο ἱερὰ ῥέζων
α	263:	νεμεσίζετο αἰὲν ἐόντας	β	46:	ἀπώλεσα, ὅς ποτ' ἐν ὑμῖν.
β	57:	τε αἴθοπα οἶνον	β	230:	ἀγανὸς καὶ ἤπιος ἔστω
β	232:	εἴη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι	β	417:	ἕζετο· ἄγχι δ' ἄρ' αὐτῆς
γ	8:	ἑκάστοθι ἐννέα ταύρους	γ	393:	τε εἰς ἅλα πέτρη
γ	435:	εἰργάζετο· ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη	δ	141:	ἐοικότα ὧδε ἰδέσθαι
δ	831:	τε ἔκλυες αὐδήν	ε	8:	ἀγανὸς καὶ ἤπιος ἔστω
ε	10:	εἴη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι	ε	81:	μεγαλήτορα ἔνδον ἔτετμεν
ε	87:	χρυσόρραπι, εἰλήλουθας	ε	255:	ποιήσατο, ὄφρ' ἰθύνοι
ε	391:	ἐπαύσατο ἠδὲ γαλήνη	η	6:	τε ἔσφερον εἴσω
η	25:	γαίης· τῷ οὔ τινα οἶδα	η	70:	αὐτοῦ Ἀλκινόοιο
η	122:	ἁλωὴ ἐρρίζωται	θ	133:	ἐρώμεθα εἴ τιν' ἄεθλον
θ	491:	παρεὼν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας	ι	56:	ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ
ι	159:	δυώδεκα, ἐς δὲ ἑκάστην	ι	215:	εἰδότα οὔτε θέμιστας
ι	438:	ἐξέσσυτο ἄρσενα μῆλα	κ	44:	ἰδώμεθα ὅττι τάδ' ἐστίν
κ	337:	κέλεαι σοὶ ἤπιον εἶναι	κ	403:	ἐρύσσατε ἠπειρόνδε
κ	404:	πελάσσατε ὅπλα τε πάντα	κ	574:	ἔνθ' ἢ ἔνθα κιόντα
μ	75:	ἐρωεῖ, οὐδέ ποτ' αἴθρη	μ	168:	ἐπαύσατο ἠδὲ γαλήνη
μ	252:	κατὰ εἴδατα βάλλων	μ	329:	ἐξέφθιτο ἤια πάντα
μ	374:	Ὑπερίονι ἄγγελος ἦλθε	ν	114:	ἐπὶ ἡμίσυ πάσης
ξ	352:	ἔα ἀμφὶς ἐκείνων.	ξ	432:	ἀολλέα, ἂν δὲ συβώτης
ο	425:	πολυχάλκου εὔχομαι εἶναι.	ο	500:	τε αἴθοπα οἶνον.
π	356:	θεῶν, ἢ εἴσιδον αὐτοί.	ρ	301:	Ὀδυσσέα ἐγγὺς ἐόντα.
ρ	536:	τε αἴθοπα οἶνον.	σ	102:	ποτὶ ἑρκίον αὐλῆς.
τ	194:	ἐὺ ἐξείνισσα	τ	233:	κατὰ ἰσχαλέοιο
τ	380:	ἐοικότα ὧδε ἰδέσθαι,	τ	403:	εὕρεο ὅττι κε θῆαι.
υ	24:	ἐλίσσετο ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,	υ	166:	Ἀχαιοὶ εἰσορόωσιν.
υ	306:	ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι.	φ	51:	σανίδος βῆ, ἔνθα δὲ χηλοί.
χ	386:	πολυωπῷ· οἱ δέ τε πάντες	χ	408:	μέγα εἴσιδεν ἔργον.
χ	426:	ἀέξετο, οὐδέ ἑ μήτηρ	ω	215:	ἱερεύσατε ὅς τις ἄριστος
ω	271:	ἐὺ ἐξείνισσα	ω	466:	τεύχεα ἐσσεύοντο.
ω	524:	δὲ εἴσατο χαλκός.	ω	273:	ξεινήια, οἷα ἐῴκειν.
κ	458:	ἄλγεα ἰχθυόεντα	φ	433:	ἔγχει, ἄγχι δ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ.

That is, the *Odyssey* has sixty-six reasonably certain examples of
hiatus at the bucolic dieresis, and there is one other passage where
the Teubner Text and Ameis-Hentze give χ 249 κενέ' εὔγματα, while
Ludwich and the Oxford Text give κενὰ εὔγματα. There are thus
sixty or sixty-one examples of this hiatus in the *Iliad* against sixty-

six or sixty-seven in the *Odyssey*, an agreement which is surprising, even if it had never been an article of higher criticism that the difference in this use was so great as to make untenable the notion of identity of authorship.

It was also a part of that doctrine that *Iliad* xxiii and xxiv shared with the *Odyssey* in the free use of this hiatus, and thus these two books separated themselves from the other books of the *Iliad*. A glance at the examples given above shows that O has eight examples, E has seven, B has six, Λ has five, while Ψ has but four, and is thus in fifth place, while Ω and P are tied for ninth place. One of the easiest suppositions of higher critics is that no one will defend certain books of the *Iliad*, so that in discussing them facts are hardly regarded as necessary.

Three books of the *Iliad* have no examples of this hiatus, Σ T X, and oddly enough three books of the *Odyssey*, ζ λ ψ, show the same absence of hiatus at the bucolic dieresis. The trouble with all such chorizontic tests is that they fail their users just when they are needed most, for nothing could be more to their liking than that *Iliad* xxii should be free from this blemish, but so are the Catalogue of the Ships and each Nekyia in the *Odyssey*, and thus this hiatus would throw the parts these critics regard as the oldest and those they regard as the latest into exactly the same stratum. The simple application of this test kills it for all the purposes of higher criticism.

If the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* show essentially the same treatment in this regard, then how did the argument advanced by Jebb and Monro ever originate? The answer to this question is simple. Monro, ¶382, "Hiatus in the bucolic dieresis is commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad* by the ratio of 2:1. It is worth notice that in this point Books xxiii and xxiv agree with the *Odyssey*, Knöss pp. 42–45." In the passage cited from Knöss that competent scholar gives a list of examples where a short vowel is not elided at the bucolic dieresis; this list has twenty-two examples for the *Iliad* and thirty-four for the *Odyssey*, omitting a total of five duplicates for both. The difference here is so small, but one example for each two books, or twelve in all, that it dwindles to little or nothing. He includes but one small part of the subject; that is, he does not discuss

hiatus in which long vowels or diphthongs are concerned, and he also has omitted such examples of the short vowel in hiatus as Δ 138, E 538, Θ 105, K 93, P 518. No one of these passages is given a digamma in the edition of Bekker nor in the grammar by Monro.

The figures by Knöss, admittedly incomplete, are changed so that they read two to one, the modifying clauses are dropped, and an overwhelming argument is advanced for diversity of authorship, an argument totally at variance with the facts in Homer, and all out of harmony with the work of Knöss, from whom these arguments are assumed to be drawn. Jebb made no reference to Knöss, but relied solely on Monro. Monro refers his arguments to Knöss, but must have quoted him at second hand, and thus was drawn into false inferences. Knöss, for example, quotes but two examples of hiatus from xxiv, so that there must be some intermediate link between this and the argument of Monro that xxiv shares with the *Odyssey* in the frequent use of hiatus at the bucolic diaeresis, since Knöss actually quotes more examples from xi than from xxiv.

This argument, when traced to its source and to Homer, like all arguments, becomes a strong proof of the identity of treatment of language in both poems.

IV. ABSTRACT NOUNS

I have luckily been able recently to trace to its source another great error of disintegrating criticism, namely the error with regard to the use of abstracts, an error that I pointed out in the *Classical Review* for February, 1910, pages 8 ff. This argument in its final form as presented by Cauer was most convincing. Cauer shows how the Homeric language had slowly progressed, and how marked the stages are in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey*, as shown by the increasing use of the abstract, in *Grundfragen*, page 393: "Maurice Croiset hat beobachtet, dass von Substantiven auf -ίη, -σύνη, -τύς die *Ilias* 39 hat, die *Odyssee* 81." However, when we turn to Croiset we find that he gives the number for the *Iliad* as 58, and not the 39 of Cauer's, and thus immediately half of the force of the argument is gone. In the article quoted above I showed that even the 58 of Croiset must be raised to 79, and, as but 81 are assigned to the *Odyssey*, the other half of the argument also vanishes.

Croiset has never, so far as I know, questioned my figures, and as the exact passage for each of these abstracts in the *Iliad* was given they cannot be overthrown.   Professor Bolling suggested to me in a conversation that there must be some excuse for Croiset in this matter other than carelessness in compilation or intentional deception, and he thought that perhaps Croiset might have excluded certain books of the *Iliad* from his calculations, and hence the low figures.   However, this view is not correct, as the passage in question has no limiting adjective connected with the word Iliad, and a footnote, page 369, where the whole matter is reviewed, shows that he had the entire poem in mind, "Il y donc en somme 81 mots abstraits en ἰη, σύνη, τύς dans le lexique de l' *Odyssée* pour 58 dans celui de l' *Iliade*."   Croiset does not quote any authority for these figures, so that the assumption would be that he had made this investigation of the abstract for himself, but this is not the case, for I have found the source of his arguments and the identical figures in Geppert, *Ueber den Ursprung der Homerischen Gesänge*, Leipzig, 1840.   Geppert was a most radical critic and deleted from the *Iliad* several thousand verses, and then based his statistics on what he regarded as the original *Iliad*.   He uses three terms for the *Iliad*—the Iliad, that is, his original poem, Accretions (Der Zuwachs), and Interpolations.   His figures for abstracts are found on page 86 of the second part.   Croiset limits the number of abstracts in -σύνη in the *Iliad* to twelve, which is precisely the number in Geppert's first list of abstracts in his *Iliad;* Geppert adds the sentence, "Der Zuwachs dieser Wörter erreicht in den späteren Gesängen fast die Anzahl derer, die sich überhaupt bei Homer finden."   Geppert then gives a list of abstracts not included in the foregoing, "in dem Zuwachs," and then an additional list of those found in the "interpolated" portions.   By adding together the abstracts found in these three strata of the *Iliad* we reach exactly the same number as that published in the article in the *Classical Review*.

It is clear that Croiset obtained his figures, not from Geppert, but from some intermediate source in which the fact was overlooked that "Iliad" in Geppert did not mean the poem of that name but meant only portions selected according to the whims of a most diligent but misguided critic.

Had Croiset studied Geppert at first hand he would never have written those pages with regard to the abstract, and he deserves severe criticism for taking over what he assumed was the correct figures of another and publishing them as his own.

Monro must have quoted Knöss through a secondary source, a reviewer, perhaps, intent on advancing a theory rather than reproducing the facts; hence Monro quotes Knöss in proof of theories entirely out of harmony with the facts there presented.

Geppert and Knöss both studied Homer at first hand, while Croiset and Monro drew their statements from these sources at such a distance that they reproduce neither the facts as given by these men nor the facts as found in Homer.

The farther higher criticism retires from Homer the more convincing it appears, and the argument with regard to the abstract which seems in Cauer an irresistible flood is only a rivulet in Croiset; but when followed to its source in Geppert and Homer it is found to be absolutely nothing.

Northwestern University

THE METHOD OF ARRIAN IN THE *ANABASIS*

By R. B. Steele

Arrian frankly admits in his Introduction that he drew most of his material from Aristobulus and Ptolemy, for one had served with Alexander and the other was a king. His final statement is that he had criticized some of the acts of Alexander, for the sake of truthfulness and as an aid to men; and this had been done not without the help of God. The latter part of this statement explains the frequent use of τὸ θεῖον and τὸ δαιμόνιον in the *Anabasis*, for they clearly indicate the religious attitude of the author. In addition to the material from his main sources he gives other items that he deems credible. Especially in iv. 14. 4; vi. 11. 2, and vii. 3. 6 he shows that on some points there were several divergent accounts, and, because of this, it was necessary for him to express his own views frequently. For this reason the *Anabasis* is not only a record of accepted facts, but also a criticism of many phases of the current history of Alexander. To show these two elements in the work, we shall divide the discussion into two parts: I, The Historical; and II, The Critical.

I.   THE HISTORICAL

A. *Aristobulus and Ptolemy.*—Aristobulus and Ptolemy are the chief guides of Arrian, but there are no statements definitely fixing the source of most of the items which he presents. The determination of the parts derived from each might be possible if we could bring to the discussion some marked features gained from a study of the works of each outside of the *Anabasis*. But in this work is found all that is left of the work of Ptolemy. We cannot tell how much of the unassigned material may be due to him, but there are at least two items. These are in i. 11. 3, the number of the troops of Alexander, given by Plutarch, *Alexander* 16, and *De Alexandri Magni Fortuna aut Virtute*, Or. i. 3. 327 E; and in i. 4. 8 an incident in the Thracian campaign, given by Strabo vi. 3. 8 C 302. Curtius says of Ptolemy in ix. 5. 21: "Scilicet gloriae suae non refragatus," and on the strength of this we might be justified in assigning to him

the passages in which he is freely mentioned, but otherwise there would be no justification for so doing.   Most of the short quotations from his work give the losses in battle, and are merely approximations stated with a preposition, as in i. 2. 7, ἀμφί; ii. 11. 8; iv. 25. 4, ὑπέρ; vi. 2. 4, ἐς.   A wound of Alexander is described in vi. 10. 1, and in vi. 11. 8 is given Ptolemy's denial that he himself was at the battle, so that he could not have been the original source of the account. In iii. 17. 6 is a short statement concerning tribute; and in v. 28. 4 a sacrifice is mentioned.

There are a few passages of considerable length definitely assigned to Ptolemy.   The first is the account in i. 8 of the capture of Thebes. Here, as also in v. 15. 2, we find πεσεῖν twice, and its compounds several times.   But the simple verb and its compounds, especially those in ἐν-, ἐπι-, and προς-, as well as the associated participles βληθείς, πληγείς, and τυπεις, are freely used throughout the *Anabasis*, and in other passages we cannot connect the verb-forms with Ptolemy. Compare vi. 11. 7, from Ptolemy, with iv. 8. 9, from Aristobulus. Arrian says in v. 20. 8 that of the rivers of India Ptolemy gave a description of the Acesines only.   This contains the words τὸ ὕδωρ κυμαίνεσθαί τε καὶ καχλάζειν, which are used again by Arrian in vi. 4. 4, in describing the juncture of the Acesines and the Hydaspes.

Here and there we find briefly stated facts assigned to Aristobulus, and these may be taken as points in his narrative not agreeing with that of Ptolemy.   A single quotation will show the general character of them all: ii. 4. 7, Ἀλέξανδρος δέ . . . . ὑπὸ καμάτου ἐνόσησεν. There are half a score of others of a similar character.   The longer quotations are, for the most part, discussions of matters technical in their nature, and calling for a vocabulary differing from that in other parts of the narrative.   The subjects are as follows: iv. 6. 1 the destruction of a part of the army; iv. 8. 9 the death of Clitus; iv. 13. 5 a Syrian prophetess; vi. 22. 4 the myrrh tree; vi. 29. 4 the tomb of Cyrus; vii. 17. 5 the entrance of Alexander into Babylon; vii. 18. 5 an account of a sacrifice; vii. 19. 3 the reception of the fleet. The first (iv. 6. 1) is most nearly like the general narrative.   Here we find the two verbs διαφθαρῆναι and κατακόψαι.   The first is in general use, as it is found in v. 20. 9 from Ptolemy, as well as in ii. 4. 9 in what purports to be a letter from Parmenio; and in iv. 4. 9,

an Arrian section. We find διακοπῆναι in vi. 22. 8, an indirect state-
ment. The compound in κατα- is most freely used, several times with
πρός, and in a series of actions is followed by ἐκόπτοντο. There are
also some statements taken from Aristobulus without acknowledg-
ment. The following are examples: In i. 16. 4 the number of men
killed at the battle of the Granicus (Plutarch, *Alexander* 16); in
ii. 5. 2 the description of the statue of Sardanapalus at Anchialus
(Strabo xiv. 5. 9 C 672); and in iii. 29. 3 the description of the Oxus
(Strabo xi. 7. 3 C 509). These, however, like the others, do not help
to fix the source of any other part of the *Anabasis*. This statement
is also true of other fragments of the work of Aristobulus. The
Alexander of Plutarch is not in all respects like his *Caesar*, but we
cannot trace any of the differences to the work of Aristobulus, of
which use was made in the *Alexander*. In chapter 31, σφᾶς αὐτούς,
though in harmony with the usage of Arrian, and contrary to Plu-
tarch's general form of statement, gives no evidence of the source
from which it came. The personal element must also be taken into
consideration, for even where Arrian and Plutarch are professedly
quoting from the same source, the phrasing is often different, and
the arrangement not the same. Illustrations of this can be found
in *Anabasis* ii. 25. 2: *Alexander* 29; i. 16. 7:16; ii. 26. 4:25; ii.
4. 9:19.

    There are a few places where Arrian mentions an item found in
neither Aristobulus nor Ptolemy, and also one found in both of
them: ii. 12. 5; iii. 26. 1; iv. 14. 1; and vi. 11. 5. There are two
passages of considerable length in which these writers do not agree.
The first is the description of the capture of Bessus, in iii. 29 ff.,
noticeable for the number of times the name of Ptolemy occurs.
He takes to himself all the credit for the capture, although Aristo-
bulus in chapter 30. 5 names Spitamenes and Dataphernes as the
captors. Both accounts have γυμνὸν ἐν κλοιῷ δήσαντα, but the words
are not used elsewhere by Arrian. The account of the battle with
Porus is much longer. A brief statement from Aristobulus is given
in v. 14. 3–4, but Arrian is not fully satisfied with this, and gives
other facts from Ptolemy. He argues that the number of chariots,
sixty, given by Aristobulus is incorrect, and in chapter 14. 6 accepts
the number, one hundred twenty, given by Ptolemy. Plutarch,

Alexander 60, twice states that his description of the battle is taken
from the epistles of Alexander. In summing up the results of the
first stage of the battle it is stated that four hundred were killed
(ἀνελεῖν), the number agreeing with that given from Ptolemy in
chapter 15. 2 (πεσεῖν ἐς). At a few points there is an evident
adaptation of the same phraseology, as Arrian has in chapter 16. 3
ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιόν, for which Plutarch has the dative; in chapter 15. 1,
from Ptolemy, προσάγειν . . . . σύν: Plutarch ἐπιέναι μετά; in
chapter 14. 3, from Aristobulus, and in chapter 14. 6, from Ptolemy,
ἐκ τῆς νήσου τῆς μικρᾶς περᾶσαι: Plutarch διαπερᾶσαι πρὸς νῆσον οὐ
μεγάλην.

There are a number of short passages in which the items are, for
the most part, unimportant, as in iii. 4. 5 the road back from the
shrine of Ammon; and in v. 20. 2 the name of a people. However,
there are three passages in which the statements referred to the two
authors contain contrasted terms. These are (1) in iii. 3. 5 the bird
leaders in the desert; (2) in vi. 3. 5 an incident in the Indian cam-
paign; and (3) in iv. 14. 3 the death of Callisthenes.

1. iii. 3. 5: The contrasted terms in this are στρατεύματος and
στρατιᾶς. The latter is freely used throughout the *Anabasis*, and
nowhere more freely than in iii. 29. 6—30. 5, where is given the
account by Ptolemy of the capture of Bessus. Arrian has the first
word in iii. 18. 1 and the second in iii. 26. 3 referring to the same body
of men. The use of two words is merely for rhetorical variation, as
of στρατιά with στρατός in vi. 5. 5; and with δύναμις in iii. 8. 6 and 7.

2. iv. 3. 5: Τὴν δὲ ἑβδόμην πόλιν ἐξ ἐφόδου ἔλαβε, Πτολεμαῖος μὲν
λέγει, ὅτι αὐτοὺς σφᾶς ἐνδόντας, Ἀριστόβουλος δέ, ὅτι βίᾳ καὶ ταύτην
ἐξεῖλεν καὶ ὅτι πάντας τοὺς καταληφθέντας ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπέκτεινε. In this
passage Arrian has ἔλαβε, and elsewhere in similar statements, but
the compound in κατα- not only here but also, apparently quoted from
Aristobulus, in vii. 19. 3; and in his own discussions in v. 7. 2 and
vii. 23. 8. We find ἀπέκτεινε in iii. 30. 4 and iv. 5. 9, both passages
probably from Ptolemy, and also quoted in iv. 8. 8 and iv. 9. 2.
From this it is clear that neither word is peculiar to Aristobulus, and
that the change in form is purely stylistic. Arrian rings all the
changes on the forms of the reflexive pronouns, and their arrange-
ment with verbs of giving. But while we find in iv. 19. 4 ἐνέδοσαν

σφᾶς αὐτούς, the preceding section has παραδιδόναι σφᾶς, and this verb occurs several times in quotations from Ptolemy. Evidently neither the form of the reflexive, nor of the verb of giving, is a test of the style of the writers, and this is still further indicated by the variations in vi. 8. 3.

3. iv. 14. 3: Here in successive clauses Aristobulus has τελευτῆσαι and Ptolemy ἀποθανεῖν. Both verbs are used for the sake of variation in iii. 27. 3, and while the usage of Arrian with these words is sharply contrasted with that of Diodorus, the same cannot be shown for the usage of Aristobulus and of Ptolemy.

B. *Other Writers.*—The quotations from other writers are valuable as illustrations, rather than for their historical content. In vi. 13. 5 there is assigned to Nearchus a line from Aeschylus (fr. 444 N.), spoken to Alexander by an unnamed Boeotian. There is also in vii. 16. 6 a line from Euripides (fr. 963 N.), and this too probably came from Nearchus, for he is mentioned in connection with the same incident by Diodorus xvii. 112. 4. Arrian further mentions from Nearchus in vi. 24. 4 the emulation of Cyrus and Semiramis by Alexander; in vii. 3. 6 Calanus; and in vii. 20. 9 a criticism of Onesicritus. The latter he names as an author in vi. 2. 3, but only to criticize, and Callisthenes and Chares not at all. He cites Eratosthenes and Megasthenes in v. 6. 1 for an item referring to India, but elsewhere he makes use of these writers, as well as of others, both named and unnamed, chiefly for critical purposes.

C. *The Ephemerides and Epistles.*—1. The account of the last days of Alexander is professedly taken by both Arrian and Plutarch from the Ephemerides, but the difference in the form of statement leads us to believe that one account was written with an eye to the other, and that we do not have unchanged what Aristobulus may have written.

2. The concurrent accounts of Diodorus, Arrian, and Plutarch (*Alexander*) establish the fact that some letters passed between Alexander and Darius in regard to the royal captives. Plutarch is briefer than Arrian in ii. 25, and in neither place is there any indication of the source of the information. The same is true in regard to the letters quoted by Arrian in ii. 14. The first of these is of a piece with the remainder of the narrative, but there are a few touches

in the reply of Alexander which show that Arrian retained some of the original phraseology. The prepositional usage does not altogether harmonize with that of Arrian. We find in section 7 οὐκ ἄκοντες παρ' ἐμοί εἰσιν, but there are not many other occurrences of the dative with παρά, and among them are αὐτῷ in iii. 19. 6 and βαρβάροις in iii. 23. 8, both in indirect statements of Alexander. We also find, instead of the usual σύν, μετά with the genitive; in section 5 Βαγώου, in section 7 σοῦ (twice) and ἐμοῦ. Noticeable also are the occurrences of περί, in section 9 with σοῦ, βασιλείας, and αὐτῆς. The use of εἰς instead of ἐς is also worthy of notice. The expression in section 9, ὅταν πέμπῃς, may not be from Alexander, but nowhere else is there such a massing of prepositions unusual for Arrian.

II. THE CRITICAL

A. *Clitarchus.*—Arrian does not mention Clitarchus, whose narrative he sought to modify or supplant, and it is toward him that many of the silences and criticisms in the *Anabasis* are directed. Some of the highly colored accounts found elsewhere (it is assumed that they originated with him) are omitted altogether by Arrian. Among these are the description of the mutilated soldiers (800 in Diodorus xvii. 69. 3; 4000 in Curtius v. 5. 5); the vengeance wreaked on the Branchidae (Curtius vii. 5. 28–35); the story of Dioxippus (Diodorus xvii. 100–101; Curtius ix. 7. 16–26); and the wounding and cure of Ptolemy (Diodorus xvii. 103. 8; Curtius ix. 8. 22). He incidentally speaks of the Amazons in iv. 15. 4; and in vii. 13. 2 states that Atropates presented to Alexander a hundred female warriors, declaring they were Amazons. This gave an opportunity to discuss the existence of the race, and in doing this he cites Xenophon and Herodotus, and states that neither Aristobulus nor Ptolemy speaks of them in connection with Alexander. Diodorus in xvii. 52 describes the greatness of Alexandria, and Arrian in iii. 2. 2 states that grain was used to mark out its site. Plutarch, *Alexander* 26, gives the marvelous addition that birds of all sizes and descriptions came from the clouds and devoured the grain. Similar to this is the treatment of the story about the eunuch attendant on the captive Persian women. He is said to have escaped, and to have carried some information to Darius. Arrian in iv. 20. 1 expressly says it was a little

after the battle of Issus, and that when Darius learned that his wife was alive and well he uttered a prayer, closing with the plea that Alexander might be king, if he himself could be no longer king of Asia.   Plutarch, *Alexander* 30, places this episode just before the battle of Arbela.   This enables him to introduce some touches that would be out of place in the narrative of Arrian.   And for the entire story he claims that there is good authority.

The account of the destruction of Persepolis is another good illustration of the method of Arrian.   He simply states in iii. 18. 11 that Alexander burned the palace in Pasargada, though Parmenio counseled saving it.   He does not mention Thais, and ends the paragraph by saying, "Alexander does not seem to me to have done this with sense."   Later, in vii. 1. 1, he mentions the return of Alexander to Pasargada and Persepolis, and in vi. 30. 1 to the palace.   The story as told by Curtius in v. 7 is a glowing one, though some of the striking details are from Livy, and a part of the conclusion is from Vergil's Aeneid.   The work is represented as being thoroughly done (section 9): "ac ne tam longa quidem aetate, quae excidium eius secuta est resurrexit.   alias urbes habuere Macedonum reges, nunc habent Parthi.   huius vestigium non inveniretur, nisi Araxes amnis ostenderet.   haud procul moenibus fluxerat: inde urbem fuisse XX stadiis distantem credunt magis quam sciunt accolae."   This however may be an adaptation from Livy; see Florus i. 16. 8.   Pliny in N.H. vi. 26. 115, "Persepolim caput regni dirutam ab Alexandro," seems to concur with Curtius, though the city still existed in the days of Ammianus Marcellinus, as is shown by xxiii. 6. 42: "Persepolis est clara."

The reason for the highly decorated story of the passage of Alexander through Carmania is given by Curtius in ix. 10. 24: "aemulatus Patris Liberi non gloriam . . . . sed etiam famam . . . . statuit imitari, animo super humanum fastigium elato."   Arrian mentions the existence of the story, but in vi. 28. 1 and 2 he pronounces it untrustworthy.

B. *The Logos.*—The term λόγος is freely used by Arrian to indicate the source of items lying outside of the work of Aristobulus and Ptolemy, some of which must have been in the work of Clitarchus. The ravens leading the army of Alexander on its march to the shrine

of Ammon are mentioned in iii. 3. 6 on the authority of Aristobulus
and of the usual report (ὁ πλείων λόγος) and this agrees with Diodorus
xvii. 49. 5.   The story (iii. 2. 1) of the founding of Alexandria is also
from the logos, and this, so far as it goes, agrees with Plutarch's
account.   Yet all that is given under λόγος cannot be referred to Cli-
tarchus, for in iv. 12. 3 is stated a piece of information which, in Plu-
tarch, *Alexander* 54, is assigned to Chares, and the verbal resemblances
show that Arrian and Plutarch are giving adaptations of the same
account.   This is also true of what Arrian in vii. 18. 6 and Plutarch,
Alexander 69, say about Calanus meeting Alexander in Babylon.   In
vii. 18. 1 there is mentioned a logos written by Aristobulus, while
forms of λέγω occur with λόγος in i. 26. 4, vi. 28. 2, and vii. 22. 1.
However, some form of ἔχω is generally used, though in i. 16. 3
there is only ὡς λόγος.

C. *Verbs of Saying and Writing.*—These verbs are used to intro-
duce an extensive indefinite element in the *Anabasis*.   Some of the
items to which reference is made were evidently in Clitarchus, as
can be seen by comparing the following passages from Arrian and
Diodorus: i. 11. 7: xvii. 17. 2; ii. 12. 3: xvii. 37. 5; as also vi. 11. 8:
Curtius ix. 5. 21; vii. 14. 7: Plutarch, *Alexander* 72.

These indefinite statements are usually in contrast with a definite
one, generally of his main sources, as in ii. 12. 5; iv. 14. 1; ii. 3. 7;
iv. 13. 5; and in vii. 3. 1 Arrian himself and Nearchus.   The most
noticeable section of all is vii. 14, where, through a long chapter,
ἄλλοι, οἱ μέν, and most frequently οἱ δέ, reveal something of the
extent to which Greek writers interested themselves in the com-
radeship of Alexander and Hephaestion.

D. *Arrian's Comments.*—That Arrian was a free editor is shown
by the dozen short passages in which he has expressed his attitude
toward his authorities and his subject.   He says in v. 14. 4 and
vi. 2. 4 that he prefers Ptolemy to Aristobulus, and not infrequently
names both.   He has half a dozen negative statements similar to
ii. 3. 8, οὐκ ἔχω ἰσχυρίσασθαι; and the same verbs in an affirmation
of something divine helping Alexander on his march through the
desert to the shrine of Ammon.   He gives a sketch of himself in
i. 12. 5, and in iv. 14. 4 calls attention to the fact that he had placed
together the description of two events that were not immediately

connected.   He diverges from his subject in iii. 5. 7 to commend the
Roman government of Egypt, and in iii. 16. 8 to call attention to the
statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton at Athens.   The characteri-
zation of Darius in iii. 22. 2–6 is more closely connected with his
subject.

The most important of the Arrian sections are those in which
judgment is passed on the character of Alexander.   His love of glory
is mentioned in vi. 13. 4, and his high ambition in vii. 1. 4.   But of
far more importance than these are the final chapters of the *Anabasis*
giving a characterization, and a discussion of criticisms passed on
him.   In addition to these three sections, there are others, usually
short, scattered through the work, either praising or condemning
some specific action.   In ii. 24. 6 mention is made of an epigram not
worthy of record, and so it is not given.   Among other long sections
are v. 7. 1—8. 1 discussing the method of bridging the Indus; ii. 16.
1–6; and iv. 28. 2 his views about Herakles.   There are shorter
sketches of Anaxarchus in iv. 9. 8; of Callisthenes in iv. 12. 6–7; and
of Clitus in iv. 9. 1.

These passages indicate that Arrian was well aware of the diffi-
culties involved in the history of Alexander, and that, for some of
them, there was no solution.   They also show that he went outside
of the Alexander historians for material to illustrate his narrative.
At the same time, so we may infer, most of his criticisms were called
forth by the character of the work of Clitarchus, just as they were
by statements of Strabo; see *Class. Phil.* XIII, 306.   The latter fur-
nished him with critical suggestions; the former with subjects to be
criticized.   As Aristobulus is the latest of the early cycle of Alexander
historians, the question has been raised whether Arrian drew his
criticisms from him.

Fränkel in *Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker*, p. 75, concludes
that both Arrian and Plutarch found in the work of Aristobulus the
indefinite expressions οἱ μὲν λέγουσι, etc.   This indefiniteness, suitable
for a writer in the position of Arrian, does not harmonize with the
assurance which we conceive belonged to the original observers of
incidents in the campaigns of Alexander.   In ii. 3. 7 and iv. 13. 5
the indefinite "they say" is put in opposition to the statement of
Aristobulus, and in iv. 14. 1 to his and Ptolemy's.   In ii. 12. 5 the

account of both of these is opposed to the logos.   But in addition
to this indefinite element there are four passages which indicate the
critical activity of Arrian independent of Aristobulus.   Two of these
(vi. 2. 3 and vii. 13. 2) were suggested by Strabo (xv. 1. 33 C 701
and xi. 5. 4 C 505), who made both statements independently of
Aristobulus.

Arrian has in vi. 11 a discussion of the wounding of Alexander
among the Malli.   One item mentioned is that some said that Crito-
demus, others that Perdiccas, acted as surgeon on the occasion.
Some also have written (vi. 11. 8) that Ptolemy was present on that
occasion, but this Arrian denies on the authority of Ptolemy himself,
and in addition (chapter 11. 2) has an original polemic against liars,
with special reference to a report that would continue if not put to
rest by his own work.   Curtius in ix. 5. 25 names Critobulus, and
in section 21 states that the story about Ptolemy was given by Clitar-
chus and Timagenes.   Not Ptolemy, but Limnaeus and Peucestes
are named as the defenders of Alexander by Plutarch, *Alexander* 63;
but in *De Alexandri Magni Fortuna aut Virtute*, Or. i. 2. 327 B, he
names Ptolemy and Limnaeus, and in Or. ii. 13. 342 D associates the
Leonnati with the plural of these names.   Arrian's criticism seems
directed at both Clitarchus and Plutarch.   In the same connection,
in opposition to the current logos, he asserts that the fight was among
the Malli, and this statement may be directed against Plutarch, *De
Fort.* ii. 13. 343 E, where the Oxydracae (Sudracae Curt ix. 4. 15) are
mentioned, though it is the Malli in 327 B and 341 C; *Alexander* 63;
and Strabo xv. 1. 33 C 701.   Another statement, also correcting the
logos, refers to Arbela, and this is in accord with Strabo and Plutarch.

Arrian begins vii. 27 with the statement that he knew many
other things had been written about the death of Alexander, and
then he mentions the story of the poison given by Iollas with Medius
as his helper.   This is suggested by Diod. xvii. 117. 5—118. 2, who
speaks of the poisoning plot, adding that, immediately after the
death of Alexander, it had been suppressed through fear of Antipater
and Cassander.   Curtius in x. 10. 14–19 follows Diodorus, and
Plutarch, *Alexander* 77, has the same story.   But Arrian adds to
this the statement that someone had not been ashamed to write
that Alexander, realizing he was doomed to die, threw himself into

the Euphrates, and Roxana was aware of the fact. Arrian says he gives these facts so as to have it known that he was aware of them, rather than that he believed them true. This remark must be taken as referring to the last item, for the poison story was too widely known to call for any comment, nor would there have been need of any if the last item had been given by Aristobulus.

Considered as a historical work the *Anabasis* is comparative rather than critical. By the side of facts gathered from Aristobulus and Ptolemy, whose trustworthiness was attested by their positions, Arrian placed facts garnered from other authors, against none of whom, save only Onesicritus, dared he bring a railing accusation. He lessens the weight of many items by referring them to indefinite authorities, but usually when his authorities disagree he cannot decide which is correct. The style is uniform throughout, and is of a piece with that in Arrian's minor works. Even the parts definitely referred to his sources, either definite or indefinite, in no way differ from the portions containing his own discussions.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF EGYPT

By W. L. WESTERMANN

Egyptian Pharaonic annals running back into the First Dynasty show that measurements of the rise of the Nile were kept even in the earliest period of the United Kingdom.[1] Breasted's hesitation in accepting the figures in these early annals as referring to the Nile rise[2] is based upon the fact that the measurements include fractions of a finger breadth, while no fractions appear in the extant readings from the Graeco-Egyptian Nilometers. If fractions of a "finger" can be used at all in the early dynasties—and they were used—certainly they can be employed in indicating the rise of the Nile as well as for any other purpose. Furthermore, the similarity of the terms used in the Nilometer readings of the Roman period with the terms of measurement found in the early annals should conclusively prove that the latter indicate the Nile rise of that year. The measurements which appear in the early annals recorded upon the Palermo Stone[3] are in cubits, spans, palms, and fingers. The Nile rise of the Roman period is recorded in cubits, palms, and fingers. It is true that in the few completely preserved lines of the Greek Nilometer readings out of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, no fractions of "fingers" appear. This must be explained either as the accident of preservation or on the ground that the fractional measurement in fingers was found in the later period to be useless and was therefore abandoned.

These early notations of the height of the Nile do not prove that an irrigation system, except of the simplest sort, was in operation before the Pyramid Age. The digging of canals and the construc-

---

[1] J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago, 1906), I, 57–60.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 54, and note.

[3] πῆ(χεις), παλ(ασταί), δάκτυλοι. L. Borchardt, "Nilmesser und Nilstandsmarken," p. 20, in *Abhand. Preuss. Akad.*, 1906. Borchardt, p. 3, accepts the measurements of the Pharaonic annals without question as those of the Nile rise, "*so genau wie möglich . . . . gemessen und aufgezeichnet.*"

tion of dikes on a large and organized scale are not to be expected until bronze tools were used.[1] The ability to build the pyramids would warrant the conclusion that the primitive and unregulated methods of using the flood waters must have been abandoned in the Pyramid Age. The Pharaohs had then the power to organize the labor of Egypt and concentrate it upon a large enterprise. Furthermore, technical skill had been advancing rapidly and was already highly developed, as the pyramid construction attests. One is not surprised, therefore, that the word for "canals" is found in the Pyramid Texts, which fall approximately in the years 2625 to 2475 B.C.[2] In the identification in these texts of the dead Pharaoh Pepi I with Osiris, Osiris is regarded as the source of the Nile flood: "The lakes fill, the canals are inundated by the purification that came forth from Osiris."[3] An inscription of the noble Uni found in his tomb at Abydos comes from the Sixth Dynasty, or twenty-sixth century B.C. In it Uni records among the offices which he had held "that of superintendent of the irrigated lands of the Pharaoh."[4] Under the Heracleopolite rulers of the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties (2445–2160 B.C.)[5] the irrigation system must have been already highly organized, with large dikes and extensive canals. Kheti II, nomarch of the Siut nome in Central Egypt, built through arable land a canal of ten cubits (about seventeen feet—width, undoubtedly). This canal supplied water to a city in the "highland district," flooded the ancient landmarks, and covered the agricultural land with water.[6] This was clearly a large irrigation ditch. The scattered data given above warrant only the following general conclusion: The beginning of the Nile irrigation system, in the sense of a great, organized, and unified method of controlling the inundation for irrigation purposes,

[1] I have been unable to trace to its source the statement of Rev. James Baikie, in his *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, p. 21, that a "commander of the inundation" is already mentioned under Zer, the successor to Menes. The existence of an officer with this title would not, in any case, affect the opinion given above.

[2] Breasted, *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (New York, 1912), p. 85.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 19. Cf. p. 88, where we read of a "herdman wading the canal immersed to his middle." The Pyramid Texts are available to me only in the excerpts translated by Professor Breasted in the above-mentioned work.

[4] *Records of the Past* (2d series), II, 6.

[5] For the dating see Breasted, *History of Egypt* (New York, 1905), p. 598.

[6] Breasted, *Ancient Records*, I, sec. 407.

falls in the third millennium (the Pyramid Age and the feudal period of Egyptian history).

In the Middle Kingdom references to dikes and canals become more frequent and definite. A papyrus of about 2000 B.C. tells us: "Those who build of granite .... who erect pyramids .... their offering tables are as empty as those of the weary ones (the serfs) who die upon the dikes."[1] At about the same time Khnum-hotep, a noble, was appointed administrator of the Eastern Desert by Amenemhet I. Among his duties were the regulation of boundaries between the cities of his nome, "establishing the landmarks as heaven; reckoning the waters according to that which was in the writings, apportioning according to that which was in antiquity."[2] Evidently the administrator of a nome had supervision over the irrigation in that nome. The apportionment of the irrigation waters to the various districts of the nome was, in this period, already fixed in written records which had the traditional support of long-established custom.

In the Middle Kingdom (Twelfth Dynasty) falls also the large irrigation project which brought the Fayum under cultivation. Herodotus' belief was that the depression in which Lake Moeris lay was an artificial excavation with the primary purpose of receiving the overflow of the Nile and acting as a regulator of the inundation from that place northward to the sea.[3] This information, accepted by Herodotus, is undoubtedly wrong,[4] and the formation of the Fayum is to be explained from geological evidence as a result of the action of nature.[5] The irrigation project of the Twelfth Dynasty, the first large enterprise of which we have definite information, seems to have been one of reclamation. To Amenemhat III is ascribed the construction of a great embankment within the Fayum, restricting the size of Lake Moeris and thus reclaiming the land laid

[1] From the conversation which a man weary of life holds with his own soul. "Gespräch eines Lebensmueden mit seiner Seele," Ad. Erman, *Abhand. der königl. Preuss. Akademie*, 1896.

[2] Percy E. Newberry, *Archaeological Survey of Egypt, Beni Hasan*, Part I (London, 1893), p. 59. Cf. the inscription of Khnum-hotep in *Records of the Past* (1st series), XII, 17.

[3] Herod. ii. 149.

[4] Major R. H. Brown, *The Fayûm and Lake Moeris* (London, 1892), pp. 19, 25–26.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 61–69.

bare.   To accomplish this some type of regulator, or lock dam, must
have been constructed at the natural entrance into the Fayum,
which made it possible to exclude any further inflow after the water
in the Fayum had reached a certain height.   This dam might be
used equally well to control the outflow from the Fayum and bring
about a more continuous and regular distribution of the water of
the flood time into the Delta.[1]   In other words, Lake Moeris became
a reservoir for the Delta for some time after the usual decline of the
Nile.

In the period of the Egyptian Empire further progress in the
development of the system is indicated in the sources.   It is especially
marked in the administrative organization.

In the reign of Thothmes III the oversight of the water supply
of entire Egypt was centralized in the hands of the vizier of Egypt.
The vizier had a corps of officials working under his direction in this
department.[2]   After the reign of Thothmes III the importance of the
irrigation system is accentuated in the inscriptions and Pharaonic
papyri by reference to various canals with distinctive names, notably
"the Water-of-Re" or the "western canal" in the Delta.[3]   In the
Papyrus Harris, Rameses III recites among his benefactions in a
prayer to Re: "I made slaves as watchmen of the canal-administra-
tion."[4]   This must refer to the appointment of slaves as guards
upon the embankments at the time of the flood, possibly with over-
sight of the corvée labor of the peasants during that period.   If this
is true, the statement indicates a highly developed organization of
the whole system of irrigation for this period.

In the Twenty-first Dynasty, under a Sheshonk whom Breasted
is inclined to regard as Sheshonk I, 945–924 B.C.,[5] we find an official
with the title "chief of irrigation."[6]   In the fifth century Herodotus
of Halicarnassus visited Egypt.   He was not sufficiently impressed
with the irrigation system itself to enumerate it among the wonders

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 69–70.   Grenfell, Hunt, Hogarth, *Fayum Towns and Their Papyri*
(P. Fay.) (London, 1900), pp. 4–5.

[2] Breasted, *Ancient Records*, II, sec. 698.

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, sec. 224, and note *d*.   Cf. the Heliopolitan canal of IV, secs. 266,
278, 394.

[4] *Ibid.*, sec. 266.

[5] *Ibid.*, IV, 359.   [6] *Ibid.*, IV, sec. 726.

of the country.   Lake Moeris alone, because of its size and because
of his belief that it was "hand-made," attracted his attention; and
he gives us some information about this reservoir which is very diffi-
cult to interpret.[1]

These scattered bits of information are what we have left out
of the period of some 2,600 years during which irrigation in the
Nile Valley was gradually evolving into the effective system which
existed when Egypt was assigned as a satrapy to Ptolemy Lagus
in 323 B.C.

Several important periods of development or of restoration of the
irrigation system appear in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.
Under Ptolemy Philadelphus occurred the reclamation of an addi-
tional tract of land in the Fayum which was incorporated in the
royal domain.   This was done by again lowering the level of Lake
Moeris, thus diminishing its size and bringing above water and
beyond the water level another portion of the former lake bed.[2]   The
evidence of this is from geographic data.   Also the archaeological
remains found in this region of the Fayum do not in any case antedate
the reign of Philadelphus.[3]

In support of this testimony comes positive documentary evi-
dence of the digging of new canals and the construction of new dikes
in the Fayum.   The period covered from the beginning to the com-
pletion of this project is approximately 270–237 B.C.[4]   The Petrie
Papyri furnish us some correspondence out of the archives of two
of the *architectones*, or chief engineers, in charge of the Arsenoite
nome, who superintended the work of construction.   The first of
these, Cleon, was chief engineer (ἀρχιτέκτων) certainly from 258 to
252 B.C.   In 255 a subengineer (ὑπαρχιτέκτων) named Petechonsis
was working under him.   An official document which falls somewhere
between 251–247 B.C. announces the advance of a man named

[1] Herod. ii. 149.   Cf. P. Fay., p. 8.

[2] P. Fay., p. 15.   Mahaffy's suggestion that the irrigation system of Egypt was
neglected by the Persian rulers (P. Pet. II, 13) may, on general principles, be true;
but the reclamation work of the early Ptolemies does not *necessitate* this as a con-
clusion.

[3] P. Fay., p. 15.

[4] Westermann, "Land Reclamation in the Fayum under Ptolemies Philadelphus
and Euergetes I," *Classical Philology*, XII, 429–30.

Theodorus from the position of subengineer to that of chief engineer. It is clear from the correspondence of Cleon with his family that he fell into disfavor with the king, Ptolemy Philadelphus, at some time in the years 251–247 B.C. and was displaced by his subordinate, Theodorus. Theodorus remains *architecton* ("chief engineer") from that time to 237 B.C. It is probable that the work was completed and the office abolished in that year or shortly thereafter.[1]

The next large enterprise in connection with the irrigation system was a thorough cleansing of the canals occurring a few years after Augustus occupied Egypt. The direction of this work is to be ascribed to Aelius Gallus, second Roman prefect of Egypt, in the years 27–25 B.C. Possibly its beginning falls under the first prefect, Cornelius Gallus, which would stretch the period to 28–25 B.C.[2]

There is no other great organization which has left a trace in the literature until we come to the time of the emperor Probus. He too, as Augustus had done, used the soldiery in his work of amelioration in Egypt.[3] Vopiscus tells us that he did so much work upon the Nile that by his efforts alone he increased the revenue in grain; that he built bridges, opened up many mouths of rivers (?), dried several swamps, and established crops and arable land where the swamps had been. This is the same type of work which was done by Aelius Gallus during his prefecture of Egypt and described in detail by Strabo (xvi. 1. 9, 10) when dealing with the Babylonian lowlands. The mouths of the canals were cleaned out and a greater volume of the overflow diverted for the use of the lands of Middle and Upper Egypt. The inundation throughout Egypt, and especially in the Delta, was thereby better regulated. Hence arable land was gained in regions which remained swampy under a neglected system. The "bridges" mentioned by Vopiscus are evidently those spanning the canals. The restoration and building of these is a marked feature of the work of the Ptolemaic irrigation engineers, Cleon and Theodorus, in the Petrie Papyri.

[1] For the chronology of this enterprise see the article just cited, *Classical Philology*, XII, 426–30.

[2] Westermann, "Aelius Gallus and the Reorganization of the Irrigation System of Egypt under Augustus," *Classical Philology*, XII (July, 1917), 237–43.

[3] Vopiscus, *Vita Probi*, 9. 3, in *Historiae Augustae Scriptores*.

It is impossible to determine exactly the date of the work of Probus in Egypt.[1] It may have been done under his direction when he was holding command in the east,[2] or under his orders after he became emperor. In the latter case the work is ascribed to the emperor as that conducted by Aelius Gallus was ascribed by Suetonius to Augustus. In any event this reorganization is to be placed somewhere in the decade 270–80 of our era.[3] It was evidently an attempt to check the decline in production from the responsive soil of Egypt which has always so amply repaid any labor expended upon it. This decline began in the third century.[4] In the fourth century the irrigation system had unquestionably lost greatly in efficiency. The ditches which carried water to the fields around Bacchias, Philadelphia, and Euhemeria had filled up, and the towns themselves were abandoned.[5] These were the Greek towns which had sprung up around the edge of the Fayum upon land reclaimed for irrigation by the *architectones* Cleon and Theodorus. Competent engineering and an effective system of irrigation had given them hard upon 600 years of life. The decline of this system gave them back to the desert.

University of Wisconsin

[1] J. H. E. Crees, *The Reign of the Emperor Probus* (London: University of London Press, 1911), p. 154.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

[3] Crees is unable to agree with Lépaulle in assigning the work of Probus in Egypt to 280–81. See Crees, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

[4] P. Fay., Introduction, p. 16.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 16 and 45.

ON δέ γε IN RETORT

By Paul Shorey

The specific, idiomatic use of δέ γε in retort, though noticed by
Niel (Appendix, *Ar. Eq.*, p. 19) and occasionally by others, is not in
my experience sufficiently appreciated by students and editors. The
purpose of this note is to collect typical and helpful illustrations of
the importance of this usage for interpretation. I take the idiom as I
find it and make no attempt to trace it to its ultimate origin. The
force of a Greek particle derives from its "original" meaning and the
associations which it gathers in idiomatic usage, but the precise
contribution of these two factors we have at present no data for
determining. The first thing to do is to understand the actual usage.
And similarly when two or more particles are used conjointly it is not
easy to decide how far each retains its separate force and how far
they blend in a new chemical union, and whether they are to be
chiefly felt in a given case as qualifying one another, or an adjoining
word, or the sentence as a whole. Both the adversative and the con-
tinuative meanings of δέ are familiar, and it might be possible to
deduce the meanings of the combination δέ γε from these and the
emphasizing, logical, argumentative, or impatient force of γε. The
combination is sometimes used in rapid advance or transition from
one sharply defined point of argument, exposition, or narrative to
another. This is the reason, unnoticed by Ritter, for its frequency
in the descriptions of the types of states and men in the eighth book
of the *Republic*. An elder, simpler, or less emphatic writer in such
case might use only δέ, as Semonides does in his enumeration of the
types of women. Ritter says that there are sixteen cases in the eighth
book of the *Republic*. My count does not quite agree, but I shall
not revise it. What imports is not the precise statistic but the reasons
for the comparative frequency. A similar frequency in the *Sophist*
and *Statesman* of Plato is due I think (1) to the antithetic point-
making in the dichotomies and (2) to the increasing tendency to
emphasis in Plato's later work, for δέ γε is often only a stronger δέ.

The combination is also used to introduce a new link in an argument—more specifically, if we may anticipate Aristotle's terminology, to introduce the minor premise of a syllogism; cf. among hundreds of available examples Plato's *Republic* 335*d*, 338*e*, 349*d*, 350*b*, 352*b*, 479*d*. A resourceful psychologist could associate this with the use of δέ γε in retort. For "argument" in the language of the people today means quarrel, and in the first book of the *Republic* when the debate grows hot and Thrasymachus begins to get angry it is neither easy nor necessary to distinguish the argumentative from the quarrelsome γε.

Dismissing then for the present these possible remoter inquiries, I turn to the direct illustration of the idiomatic use of δέ γε in retort. I do not find it in Homer. Monro quotes two cases of separated δέ γε, in one of which (*Iliad* v. 350) there is hostile feeling if not precisely retort. But in the cases recorded in the Homeric lexicon γε following δέ, often at a distance, is itself usually attached to a pronoun. In the angry anacoluthon beginning εἰ δ' ἔτ' ἀνιήσει γε, *Odyssey* 2. 115, there seems no reason for taking γε closely with the verb, and we have perhaps an approximation to retort.

There are, I believe, no cases in the Greek lyrics of the Teubner *Anthologia Lyrica*. But in the *Carmina Popularia* the song of the three generations at Sparta, whatever its date, is an excellent example.

The old men sing:

> Ἀμὲς πόκ' ἦμες ἄλκιμοι νεανίαι.

The men retort:

> Ἀμὲς δέ γ' εἰμές· αἰ δὲ λῇς, αὐγάζεο.

And the boys come back at them with:

> Ἀμὲς δέ γ' ἐσσόμεσθα πολλῷ κάρρονες.

Keil's conjecture δέ τε is obviously inept. Fragment 13 Ἥλιος Ἀπόλλων, ὁ δέ γ' Ἀπόλλων ἥλιος looks like a case, but we cannot be sure in the absence of a context.

In Herodotus I find but two instances. In vii. 103 Xerxes retorts to Demaratus' boasting, "If a Spartan army can fight ten times their number of Persians σε δέ γε δίζημαι εἴκοσι εἶναι ἀντάξιον." In viii. 59, when Adeimantus rebukes Themistocles with the words ἐν τοῖσι ἀγῶσι, etc., he retorts οἱ δέ γε, etc. Plutarch, *Themist.* 11, has

Ναί . . . . ἀλλά. In both cases Stein is silent. In vii. 103 Smith and Laird give a note on δέ in apodosis with a reference to σὺ δέ in vii. 51. 3 which I think is not quite apposite.

I have observed but one case in Thucydides, and that naturally in the Melian dialogue v. 109, where the Athenian's τὸ δ' ἐχυρόν γε, etc., is the reply to the Melian's βεβαιοτέρους.

The best case in Aeschylus is Antigone's retort to the herald in *Septem* 1031.

<div align="center">ἐγὼ δὲ Καδμείων γε προστάταις λέγω</div>

The metrically unavoidable separation of the particles makes no difference. Tucker rightly enough says, "The suggestion of γε is that of contemptuous sarcasm." But he does not seem to feel the idiomatic tone of δέ γε. I believe the passage genuine, but there is no lack of other Aeschylean examples. Danaus' reply to his daughters' fears of their pursuers in 746 is phrased as if it were a defiant retort to the Egyptians' threat. He says

<div align="center">πολλοὺς δέ γ' εὑρήσουσιν, etc.</div>

So in *Supplices* 1055–56,

<div align="center">σὺ δὲ θέλγοις ἂν ἄθελκτον,</div>

is met by the distinct retort,

<div align="center">σὺ δέ γ' οὐκ οἶσθα τὸ μέλλον.</div>

In *Agamemnon* 939,

<div align="center">ὁ δ' ἀφθόνητός γ' οὐκ ἐπίζηλος πέλει,</div>

is a sharp retort in stichomythia. In *Choephori* 439,

<div align="center">ἐμασχαλίσθη δέ γ', ὡς τόδ' εἰδῇς,</div>

the text is uncertain. Blass, Verrall, and Sidgwick give little aid. Hermann's δέ γε could be explained as expressing the emotional defiance of the chorus' admonition with its implication, "Remember and do not pardon." In *Choeph.* 921,

<div align="center">τρέφει δέ γ' ἀνδρὸς μόχθος ἡμένας ἔσω,</div>

it is a stichomythic retort in the eternal debate between the sexes.

There are several good cases in Sophocles. In the altercation between Menelaus and Teucer in the *Ajax* (1142) Menelaus begins a speech with

<div align="center">ἤδη ποτ' εἶδον ἄνδρ' ἐγώ,</div>

and Teucer retorts (1150),

<p style="text-align:center">ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄνδρ' ὄπωπα.</p>

Jebb has no note, but his translation gives the tone fairly, "Yea and I have seen." In *Electra* 1367 σφῶν δ' ἐννέπω γε is probably better than Hermann's ἐννέπω 'γώ. Jebb interprets "and further (γε, i.e., besides counseling Electra)." I think, if we may refine so far, that it is preferably a rebuke delayed and so disguised by the three introductory lines of the speech. For δέ γε in the retort of an implied friendly rebuke compare Plato, *Phaedr.* 275*b*.

Phaedr.: Ὦ Σώκρατες, ῥᾳδίως σύ, κ.τ.λ.

Soc.: Οἱ δέ γ', ὦ φίλε, κ.τ.λ.

Phaedr.: Ὀρθῶς ἐπέπληξας

In *O.T.* 1030, though the particles are widely separated, there is a hint of rebuke in the shepherd's words σοῦ δ', ὦ τέκνον, σωτὴρ γε τῷ τοτ' ἐν χρόνῳ. The reading δέ then is preferable to τε or to a double γε. Jebb aptly comments "the gentle reproof conveyed by δέ γε is not unfitting in the old man's mouth." *Philoctetes* 1293, ἐγὼ δ' ἀπαυδῶ γ', is a clear case. Jebb's "γε emphasizes the verb, cf. 660. 1037" cannot be said to be wrong. Yet it is misleading. In 660 there is no δέ. In 1037 ἔξοιδα δ' ὡς μέλει γ' the δέ is adversative to the doubt in the preceding line and the δέ and γε are probably felt separately. This, as I said at the beginning, is a difficult distinction, but it has to be drawn. In *Ajax* 1409, for example, παῖ, σὺ δὲ πατρός γ' . . . . θιγών, κ.τ.λ., I think that Jebb is mistaken in saying that "the emphasis of γε belongs to the whole clause (do thou too raise) and not to the word πατρός." This is not to be felt as a case of the δέ γε combination. The σὺ δέ, as Jebb himself points out, is idiomatic after the vocative, and γε is what in the freedom of classroom interpretation I sometimes call the *ex vi termini* γε. As often in Plato, it emphasizes a word to point out what follows from its very connotation. The child would not normally be called upon, but of course it must lend its feeble aid in the case of a father. It is possible, however, that δέ γε simply expresses the defiant mood of the speaker.

Euripides presents no striking peculiarities, but many good examples, of δέ γε. It brings out the colloquial smartness of Ion which Jules Lemaître maliciously emphasizes (*Impressions de*

Théâtre, IX), and which embarrasses idealizing English translators. In 516–17 I am tempted to translate the stichomythia of Xuthus and Ion:

> Hail, all hail, my boy, that greeting is the best from me to you.
> I'm all hale, you keep—your distance. Then we'll be all hale, the two.

In 368 it emphasizes Creusa's retort ἀλγύνεται to Ion's αἰσχύνεται. In 1304 Musgrave's transposition destroys its pertinency in the stichomythia following 1303. In 1330 we have plainly a retort. In *Alcestis* 890 it expresses a slight rebuke, sometimes overlooked by editors. In *Andromache* 239 δέ . . . . γε may be felt separately, but also as marking retort in stichomythia. In 462 the adversative use is practically a retort, as in *Orestes* 547 and *Hippolytus* 700 it is an answer to an argument. In *Supplices* 936 and 940 it is merely sharp opposition of two groups. In *Hippolytus* 724 καί . . . . γε is equivalent to δέ . . . . γε in retort, an obvious possibility. Space fails for discussion of other examples of this use of καί . . . . γε. In *I.A.* 21 τοῦτο δὲ γ᾽ ἐστιν τὸ καλὸν σφαλερόν is a plain case of retort. In *Cyclops* 561 δέ γε expresses the "wipe-off-your-chin" style of rudeness, and in 637 the Aristophanic outbidding in comic distress. In *Hecuba* 421 it is the same on the plane of tragedy. In 1247–48 contrast expresses contempt if not retort. *Bacchae* 490 and 505 are retorts in stichomythia. In *Helena* 564 ἐγὼ δὲ Μενελάῳ γέ σ᾽ the elliptic colloquial suggestion of a comic comeback invites and justifies Aristophanes' parody in *Thesmophoriazusae* 910.

Porson on *Orestes* 1234 cites a few cases, and Elmsley on *Medea* 800 quotes *Androm.* 237; *Herc.* 1248; and what is now *Nauck Adespota* 358,

> ἀνδροκτόνου γυναικὸς ὁμογενὴς ἔφυς,
> σὺ δ᾽ αὐτόχειρ γε μητρὸς ἢ σ᾽ ἐγείνατο,

which is a direct retort.

Aristophanes illustrates the pugnaciousness of δέ γε. Cleon and the sausage seller use it repeatedly in rapid-fire repartee of Billingsgate (cf. *Knights* 363, 364–65, 1154–56; *Lysistrata* 374; *Clouds* 914–15; *Birds* 1053). It also marks their endeavors to outbid one another for Demos' favor (906–8; cf. 967, 1171, 1178; *Frogs* 1395; *Lysistrata* 104–5, 115–17). In *Wasps* 941 outbidding and

retort are blended. In *Plutus* 164–68 Chremylus and Charion out-
bidding one another in parallels and parodies use it seven times.
Distinct retorts are *Clouds* 1417; *Birds* 1043; *Wasps* 1230. In
Birds 806 it is the retort of one "odorous" comparison for another.

Many of the Aristophanic examples could be brought under the
category already mentioned of descriptive or argumentative point-
making. The student guide so employs δέ γε in *Clouds* 169, 175, 211;
cf. also *Wasps* 604; *Birds* 514; *Ecclesiazusae* 262. *Plutus* 165–68
might be classified again here. In the frequent use of ἐγὼ δέ γε it is
hardly necessary always to determine the precise proportions of
defiance, outbidding, retort, or point-making implied in the general
adversative meaning. Much the same might be said of the phrases
so common in Plato: ὅταν δέ γε; ἐὰν δέ γε; τὸ δέ γε, οἶμαι δέ γε.
The often unnoticed, careless, colloquial Greek and Platonic idiom
τί δ' ἄλλο γε ἤ occurs frequently in Aristophanes. I think psychologi-
cal analysis could detect a slight residue of δέ γε feeling in it, but I
forbear. In *Ecclesiazusae* 273 and 279 δέ γε at the end of the line (cf.
Menander *Epitrepontes* 504; Demosthenes xxi. 95) is either metrical
convenience or point-making in a description or a program. In
Wasps 1230 at the end of the line it is practically a retort.

The statistical count of δέ γε in Plato is considerable. Ritter
(*Untersuchungen*, pp. 69–70) gives it after Frederking. I have no
ambition to revise it, though my suspicions are aroused by the state-
ment that there is no case in the *Apology;* cf. 22D and 24C: where
the statistician perhaps adopted Cobet's emendation or followed
the wrong manuscript. It would be of little significance unless
regard were paid to our categories of point-making, minor premise,
etc., in distinction from our present concern, its use in retort or
implied rebuke. These things are of course not unknown, but editors
and students continually miss them. Thompson's otherwise excellent
note on *Meno* 95e tells us that the combination occurs twelve times
in the *Meno* and, wrongly I think, that at 77b there is a hyperbaton of
γε which accents παραδείγματα. He mentions its use to attach a
further premise, but says nothing of its use in retort. The distinct
retort in *Apol.* 24c is often overlooked by editors, though not by
Schanz. Forman, for example, only comments "γε with ἐγώ" and
in his Appendix discusses only the question whether γε affects δέ or
only the preceding word. In *Politicus* 257a it is, I think, a mistake

to bracket γε. The whole tone of the passage is that of heavy
repartee. It is a case of outbidding, as *Theaetetus* 165*d; Philebus* 48*e*
(*bis*); *Politicus* 295*b*. In *Laches* 198*c* it is a slightly challenging
question to prepare for the issue. In *Gorgias* 448*a* it expresses the
rudeness or overeagerness of Polus. In 472*e* and 473 an opposition
of opinion becomes a challenge. In 495*d* it is almost an Aristophanic
conflict. The *Gorgias* has also many examples of δέ γε in argument
or minor premise. In *Euthydemus* 298D αὐτίκα δέ γε, "I'll prove it
to you right away," the tone is challenging. An appreciation of the
tone of playful retort in *Phileb.* 28A might save some scholars
from arguing that the idea of good is to be literally identified with
God. οὐδέ γε here as in many cases keeps the feeling of δέ γε (cf.,
e.g., *Protagoras* 28*a* and Eurip. *I.A.* 308. In *Phileb.* 34*e* τοῦτο δέ
γ' ἐστὶ κενοῦται it substitutes a synonym as a link or minor premise
in a chain of argument. So *Theaetet.* 152B, 164B and elsewhere
often. In *Phileb.* 66E ff., δέ γε advances from point to point to the
culminating defiance πρῶτον δέ γε οὐδ' ἂν οἱ πάντες . . . . φῶσι.
Phaedr. 230C σὺ δὲ γε ἀτοπώτατος is another gentle rebuke. *Republic*
487E σὺ δέ γε οὐκ εἴωθας is a similar ironical rebuke which editors miss.
Republic 450B also implies a rebuke of the preceding use of μετρίων.

The *Laws* do not offer so many occasions for δέ γε as *Republic* viii
and the *Sophist* and *Statesman*, but there are plenty of examples of
the logical, the adversative, and the point-making force of the com-
bination. In 676*b* the adversative force approaches retort. Jowett's
translation is not incorrect, but does not reproduce this shade of
feeling. In 638*a* δέ γε marks a sharp dramatic retort which Jowett
imperfectly renders and on which Stallbaum has no note. The
Athenian has been citing the laws of various nations and the Spartan
retorts: Ὦ λῷστε διώκομεν δέ γε ἡμεῖς πάντας τούτους. But it
would be superfluous to accumulate further examples or to split
hairs in determination of the precise point at which adversative
or emphatically continuative δέ γε begins to pass into point-making,
positing of a minor premise, outbidding, challenge, rebuke, and
retort. I have sufficiently indicated the chief types.

The only good retort that I have found in Xenophon is
Mem. iv. 4. 6, ὁ δέ γε τούτου δεινότερον, ἔφη, ὦ Ἱππία, οὐ μόνον ἀεὶ τὰ
αὐτὰ λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν. In iv. 6. 4 and iv. 6. 14 we have
merely the familiar use to introduce a minor premise in Platonic

dialogue.   In iii. 6. 31 the particles are adversative and in iv. 3. 13
the text is doubtful.   In *Hellenica* ii. 3. 38 the adversative almost
equals a retort, as it does in Xenophon's speech (*Anab.* iii. 1. 35) and
in the divergent opinion of Kleanor (iv. 6. 9).   In v. 8. 16 it may be
said to mark a climax or defiance, ἄλλον δέ γε . . . . ἔπαισα πύξ.
In iii. 3. 17 the text is doubtful.   In *Symp.* iv. 13 it is merely a strong
adversative.   In v. 3. it approaches the retort of bantering dialogue,
ἀλλ' ἀποκρίνω.   σὺ δέ γε ἐρώτα.   *Cyr.* i. 6. 18 is unimportant.

The Attic orators use δέ γε sometimes in argument, contrast,
and retort.   But there is not enough dialogue to give them frequent
occasion for it.   Statistics would be of little value.   Forman says
his series is complete.   I have glanced through my hand copies and
consulted indexes.   In Andocides, *Mysteries* 136, ὑμῖν δέ γε (τὸ)
ἐναντίον, it is a strong adversative.   In 68, ἐσώθη δέ γε ὁ πατήρ, the
adversative becomes a defensive retort to the charge of betraying
his comrades.   There is little point in the inquiry whether γε empha-
sizes δέ or ἐσώθη.   Forman supports the view of Kühner and Hartung
that γε in such cases must re-enforce a particular word and not the
adversative implication of δέ by the argument that the substitution
of an adversative expression of undisputed emphasis involves a
material shift in the thought accent.   But in Homer, *Iliad* xv. 496–97,
a close parallel to Andocides' thought is expressed by ἀλλά.

οὔ οἱ ἀεικὲς . . . .

τεθνάμεν. ἀλλ' ἄλοχός τε σόη καὶ παῖδες ὀπίσσω

Such difference as there is between the two passages is due, not to
the emphasis on ἄλοχος or σόη or πατήρ or ἐσώθη, but only to the fact
that the words of Homer are an exhortation and those of Andocides a
retort.   If there was no feeling of the intimate association of δέ γε
in such cases, why are they so often juxtaposed in cases where it
would have been easy to place the γε after the word which it is said
to be its sole function to emphasize?   Van Cleef's *Index Antiphonteus*
gives no examples and I find none.   Holm's *Index Lysiacus* does not
give γε.   I find no examples in Frohberger's index or in glancing
through the text.   Preuss's *Index Isocrateus* omits γε and gives no
examples under δέ γε.   I find none in rapid re-reading.   Preuss's
index to Demosthenes does not record δέ and there are no exam-
ples in the Rehdanz-Blass index.   Demosthenes neglects some apt

occasions for the use of δέ γε in retort and employs it rarely if at all.
In *F.L.* 90, ἡ δέ γε τῶν πραγμάτων κατασκευή, it is merely a strong
adversative.   Shilleto's note speaks of this use of δέ γε or δέ . . . .
γε in continuation or retort and refers to Euripides and Aristophanes.
He can hardly be right in saying that it is frequent in the orators.
In v. 23. 19, 90, and xxiv. 129 it is adversative.   In xix. 279 it con-
cludes with a climax a series of adversative uses of δέ.   In xx. 28
an adversative following an apostrophe becomes practically a retort.
The more personal tone of xxi (against Midias) perhaps finds expres-
sion in three instances, 19, 90, 279.   In xliii. 27 and 39, xliv. 55,
xlvi. 6, the adversative argument is in effect a retort.   In liv. 35–36
the adversative is outbidding (cf. *supra*).   The two cases in the
spurious *Epitaphios* (lx. 36 and 37) mark rhetorical antithesis.

Aeschines, with Andocides perhaps the most colloquial of the
orators, has a few good cases.   In iii. 28 it opposes or retorts the
letter of the law against Demosthenes' evasion.   In iii. 117 he
quotes a speech against Athens at Delphi beginning ἀρχὴν δέ γε and
he himself uses it three times in section 246 to point the contrast
between Athenian public policies and their influence on the moral
education of youth.

The fragments of the comedians have not enough dialogue to pre-
sent many cases.   In Pherecrates' μέλι δέ γε χρέμπτεται the particles
mark the outrageousness of the coarse climax.   In Eupolis (*Pollux*
x. 136), ἐγὼ δέ γε στίζω σε βελόναισιν τρισίν, it is the Billingsgate of
retorted threats, as in the *Knights*.   In Nichomachus' εἴσομαι δέ γ᾽
ἂν λέγῃς (Athenaeus 290e) it expresses the bantering pretense of
retort so common in Platonic dialogue.   My other examples are
hardly worth printing.

In Menander's *Epitrepontes* 63, ἐγὼ δέ γ᾽ αὐτόν φημι δεῖν ἔχειν
χάριν, etc., Daos is stating both sides of the case and δέ γε marks his
retort to the opponent's plea.   In 503–4

<div align="center">

οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὅτι λέγεις

Onesimos: ἡ γραῦς δέ γε οἶδ᾽

</div>

the retort is obvious.   *You* may not know, but the old woman does know.

Bonitz' Aristotelian index does not record δέ γε.   I do not think
that Aristotle uses it in retort.   It is not found in the argument in
the *Metaphysics* against Protagorean relativity, where the impatient

argumentative γε is frequent.   Eucken says that δέ γε is practically
confined to the *Physics*.   A rapid reading discovers five or six cases
at most introducing premises in controversial argument—none of any
special significance.

The post-classical history of Greek particles has only a slight
interest of curiosity.   The feeling for idiomatic usage gradually dies
out till little more survives than the obvious irony of δῆθεν in the
modern Greek newspaper.

Schmidt's *Atticismus* records δέ γε for *Dio. Chrys.* xi. 4 and xxxi. 4
and οὐδέ γε for i. 25. 22, and so forth.   He finds thirty-two cases in
Aristides' first forty-six orations, and enumerates twenty-eight cases
in Lucian.   They seem mostly merely emphasized adversatives or
slight climaxes of satire, sometimes rather awkwardly employed.
The Hermotimus naturally presents a few cases of argumentative
δέ γε.   Lucian does not seem to have picked up the δέ γε of retort
or rebuke from his reading of Aristophanes and Plato.

Liddell and Scott offer nothing but the misleading statement that
in Plato (*Theaetet.* 144e and 164a) δέ maintains its right to the
second place in the sentence separating γε from the word it affects.
Jowett and Campbell's essay on the particles (*Republic*, II, 204) says
only that δέ γε ("yes, but") often contributes a second statement
which in some way modifies the first.   Kühner-Gerth (*Syntax* 2, 141)
say that γε in δέ γε as in μέν γε affects both the other particle and
the preceding word.   They cite Xen. *Anab.* iii. 1. 35 and *Mem.* ii. 6.31,
of which the first is implied defiance and retort, the second a strong
antithesis.   Starkie on Aristophanes' *Wasps* 94 and 134 has the root
of the matter, but confines himself to a few examples from Aristoph-
anes.   Stephanus quotes *Apollon. de conjunct.* for the Stoic designa-
tion of δέ γε as προσληπτικόν because of its use in the "assumption"
or minor proposition of a hypothetical syllogism, a use too frequent in
post-classical literature to need illustration.   He cites a few cases
from Aeschylus and Sophocles to exemplify *hanc augendi vim*, thus
confounding all categories.

There is nothing of importance in Hermann or Viger and nothing
in Hoogeveen or Bäumlein.   Hartung (Erlangen, 1832), I, 382
quotes a few examples of "adversative clauses" from Aristophanes
and Euripides in support of his view that γε merely emphasizes a
particular word.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A HISTORICAL ALLUSION EXPLAINED

"Iam vero variae nocturno tempore visae
terribiles formae bellum motusque monebant,
multaque per terras vates oracla furenti
pectore fundebant tristis minitantia casus,
atque ea, quae lapsu tandem cecidere vetusto
haec fore perpetuis signis clarisque frequentans
ipse deum genitor caelo terrisque canebat.
nunc ea Torquato quae quondam et consule Cotta
Lydius ediderat Tyrrhenae gentis haruspex
omnia fixa tuus glomerans determinat annus, etc." (Cic. *De Con-
sulatu* ii. 26–35).

In the lines immediately before these Cicero has related the portents of
the year 63, and in lines 33–59 he describes those of 65, the fulfilment of
which, as he says in line 35, was to fall in 63. The intermediate three lines
(ll. 30–33) seem capable of no easy application to either the former or the
latter of the two groups of portents; to the former, because the conspiracy
of Catiline was not yet crushed; to the latter, because the miscarriage of the
conspiracy of 65 would in 63 hardly be regarded as *vetusto*.[1]

Varied means of avoiding the dilemma have been sought, most of which
may be found in the editions of Moser (1828) and Giese (1829), and an
article by Thoresen[2] in 1893. The more distinctive are here briefly noted.
Hottinger would interpret the words *lapsu vetusto* as *ruina diu ante velut
praestituta; dum scil. Catilina, quam aliis meditatus esset perniciem, eam sibi
ipse machinaretur* (which hardly meets the objection to the use of *vetusto*);
Goerenz as *diu labantia tandem ruinam dederunt*, making *vetusto* practically
equivalent to *diu exspectato*, surely an unfamiliar use of the word. Another
group of interpretations understands *lapsu* literally (of statues from their
pedestals, etc.; cf. the fall of the statue of Natta mentioned in ll. 39–40;
the *simulacra deorum depulsa* of Cic. *in Cat.* iii. 19; or the *signum*. . . . .
Iovis cum columna disiectum of Obsequens 61). Davies, holding this view
but troubled by the use of *vetusto* as applied to such an occurrence only two
years previously, emends to *vetusta*; Ernesti, Scheller, and Heeringa retain

---

[1] Further, according to this interpretation the repeated beginning for the events
of 65 in l. 33 (*nunc ea*, etc.), would be very awkward.

[2] *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi*, 3d series, II (1893), 24–26.

the manuscript reading but explain the words as poetic expressions for *lapsu rerum vetustarum*, or, as Heeringa rather clumsily suggests, *lapsu vetustate;* while Thoresen, in the article cited, resorts to an elaborate emendation (*atque ea qui lapso* [or *lapsus*] *tum decidit aere vetusto*) which he later[1] discards, simply obelizing the line.   The difficulty with the theory that *ea* refers to material things, such as statues, is, as noted by Hottinger, that it confuses the sign with the thing signified (for to the latter *haec fore* must refer).   If it be urged that these lines refer to a re-erection of the statue of Jupiter[2] valid objection may be taken to the use of the plurals (*ea, haec*) and to the separation of these lines from the passage (ll. 55 ff.) in which that restoration is discussed at length.

We should, if possible, retain the accepted text, especially since the MSS here show no variation, save *lapsus* for *lapsu* in AH.[3]   I believe that for this accepted text a plain and very effective meaning can be found along quite different lines from those indicated in the attempts thus far mentioned, namely by keeping *lapsu* in the sense of "failure" and interpreting *ea quae lapsu tandem cecidere vetusto* of the events foretold by the portents in the Bellum Octavianum of 87.   In support of this there should be noted the fact that lines 12–29 describe, as already stated, the portents of the year 63: *cometae*, an eclipse of the moon, *Phoebi fax* (meteor), the striking by lightning of a man (of high rank, as we know from Pliny[4]), an earthquake, ghosts, and miscellaneous prophecies.   If now we compare these with the *de Natura Deorum* ii. 14, we shall find there a list in which appear *fulminibus, tempestatibus, ... terrae motibus . . . . tum labibus aut repentinis terrarum hiatibus, ... tum facibus visis caelestibus, tum stellis iis quas Graeci cometas, nostri cincinnatas vocant, quae nuper bello Octaviano magnarum fuerunt calamitatum praenuntiae*, etc.   Of course the phrase *quae nuper . . . . praenuntiae* refers only to *cometae*, and we have no right to assume that the other signs in Cicero's list, which is a general one, are taken from occurrences in 87.   But *cometae* (whether comets proper or, as is perhaps more likely in the poem, displays of the *aurora polaris*) were not of everyday occurrence at Rome, for Wülker[5] in his list of them cites no instance between 87[6] and 63.   Further, the likeness in the item of *fulmina* becomes the more striking when we observe that in the Octavian war no less a personage than Pompeius Strabo met his death by lightning,[7] corresponding well to the death of this kind described by Cicero in the poem.   In the verses before us Cicero is probably

[1] In his edition (1894).

[2] Obsequens 61; *et al.*

[3] Not affecting the meaning of l. 30, *frequentas* for *frequentans* in ABV in l. 31.

[4] *N.H.* ii. 137.

[5] *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienwesens bei den Römern* (1903), p. 10.

[6] Attested also by Pliny *N.H.* ii. 92.

[7] App. *B.C.* i. 68; i. 80; Plut. *Pomp.* 1; Obsequens 56a; *et al.*

not limiting his recollection to the one episode of the Bellum Octavianum, but rather extending it to the entire period of the civil war, of which it was a part. The general meaning, then, of lines 30–33, as I understand them, is that the violent measures of that turbulent period, foretold by many portents, some of them distinctive and unusual, at last (*tandem*, i.e., with the final victory of Sulla) failed, years ago (*lapsu vetusto*), but that similar revolutionary attempts (*haec*) will recur (*fore*) during the consulship of Cicero is predicted by Jupiter in clear and repeated (*frequentans*) portents. Or, in mathematical form: as the portents of 87 were related to the events of that and the following years, so the portents of 63 are in relation to the still unknown events of that and succeeding years. This explanation robs *vetusto* of much of its difficulty, for it is hardly necessary to object to its use, in the free language of verse, for events of a score of years previous; it well explains the word *tandem*; it avoids the confusion of sign and thing signified by taking both *ea* and *haec* as events; and, more than all, it adds greatly to the striking character of the situation by equating the petty Catilinarian conspiracy with the tremendous struggle of the civil war between Marius and Sulla.[1] That Cicero really made such comparisons a well-known passage in the third oration against Catiline[2] shows us.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Anthologia Palatina xv. 23

Mr. W. R. Paton in his translation of the Greek Anthology, Vol. 5 (Loeb Classical Library), says of the foregoing epigram, which is inscribed "On the Book of Marcus" (Εἰς τὴν βίβλον Μάρκου): "Nothing is known regarding it." The epigram refers to the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius; it occurs as a "Subscriptio" to the Codex Vaticanus of Marcus Aurelius, and is quoted by Salmasius (*ad Vulcacii Gallicani Avidium Cassium* c. 3. 7) as having been found by him "in vetustis membranis"; cf. Gataker (London, 1697), two pages before the *Annotationes* on the text; the information is also contained on the last page of Leopold's Oxford edition.

W. D. WOODHEAD

---

[1] Perhaps in the earlier part of the poem this comparison had been more fully developed. If so the rather casual allusion in ll. 30–33 would have been clearer to the reader.

[2] 24. Although, with characteristic vanity, he considers the plot of Catiline far more momentous than all other *dissensiones* with which he compares it. That Cornelius Lentulus, from a different standpoint, drew somewhat parallel comparisons is shown by Sall. *Cat.* 47. 2: "ex libris Sibyllinis regnum Romae tribus Corneliis portendi: Cinnam atque Sullam antea, se tertium esse, cui fatum foret urbis potiri; praeterea ab incenso Capitolio illum esse vigesumum annum, quem saepe ex prodigiis aruspices respondissent bello civili cruentum fore."

Ovid *Metamorphoses* i. 192–98

"sunt mihi semidei, sunt, rustica numina, nymphae
faunique satyrique et monticolae silvani;
quos quoniam caeli nondum dignamur honore,
quas dedimus, certe terras habitare sinamus.
an satis, O superi, tutos fore creditis illos,
cum mihi, qui fulmen, qui vos habeoque regoque,
struxerit insidias notus feritate Lycaon?"

On these lines Haupt (Ehwald-Haupt, Berlin, 1903) contents himself with the comment "die Motivierung ist wohl Erfindung des Ovids." His conjecture admits, I think, of easy confirmation. The transition passage in which the lines occur is admittedly a travesty of the Roman senate. Lines 190–91 have been noted as a commonplace of Roman political oratory; cf. Burmann, *ad loc.*, and Muretus in his comment on Cicero, Cat. ii. 5. 36–37. It seems fair to see in lines 192 ff. an ingenious adaptation of the traditional appeal to a Roman audience to rally to the defense of the socii who, though not endowed with citizenship, are entitled to protection. The best comment on the motivation of this passage would accordingly be another quotation from Cicero; cf. Manil. vi. 1–5, "Quare si propter socios nulla iniuria lacessiti maiores nostri cum Antiocho, cum Philippo, cum Aetolis, cum Poenis bella gesserunt, quanto vos studio convenit iniuriis provocatos sociorum salutem una cum imperii vestri dignitate defendere, praesertim cum de maximis vestris vectigalibus agatur?"

<div align="right">KEITH PRESTON</div>

BOOK REVIEWS

The Greek Theater and Its Drama. By ROY C. FLICKINGER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1918. Pp. xxviii+358. 80 illustrations.

This is a book for which we have long been waiting; one, that is, that can be unhesitatingly recommended to the general reader as a reasonably satisfactory account of the Greek theater and the technique and conventions of the Greek drama. Like all of the author's numerous articles previously published, it is written in a pleasing and forceful style, and gives evidence of sound scholarship and of a firm grasp upon the problems with which it deals. Its statements are clear, its arguments cogent, and its conclusions sane. Moreover, it abounds in literary citations and is enriched with many illustrations which for the most part are well selected and beautifully reproduced. Thus it constitutes one of the most important contributions of recent years to the interpretation of ancient classical dramatic art. Among the works published in English upon this subject it easily takes rank as the best.

As stated in the Preface the book attempts (1) "to elaborate the theory that the peculiarities and conventions of the Greek drama are largely explicable by its environment; (2) to emphasize the technical aspects of ancient drama; (3) to elucidate and freshen ancient practice by modern and mediaeval parallels." The author has "endeavored to treat the ancient plays as if they were not dead and inert, but as if their authors were men as real as Ibsen and Galsworthy, who had real problems and met them in a real way." In accordance with this program the emphasis throughout is placed upon the conventions and technique of the drama rather than upon the archaeological reconstruction of the theater itself. Thus eight of the nine chapters which constitute the main portion of the work treat of the influences (1) of religious origin, (2) of choral origin, (3) of actors, (4) of festival arrangements, (5 and 6) of physical conditions, (7) of national customs and ideas, and (8) of theatrical machinery and dramatic conventions. The ninth chapter is devoted to a consideration of theatrical records. Preceding these chapters is a long Introduction (pp. 1–117), in which, rather more technically, the author discusses the origin of each of the types of Greek drama and finally the development and characteristics of the Greek theater.

The difficulties which surround the topics treated in this Introduction are clearly recognized by the author, and he, I am sure, would be the first to acknowledge that his conclusions cannot be expected to meet with universal acceptance. As a rule these are not stated dogmatically, but are advanced merely as reasonable hypotheses. Taking his stand squarely on the statements of Herodotus, Aristotle, and other classical and postclassical writers,

179

Professor Flickinger holds (pp. 3 f.) that "tragedy and satyric drama are independent offshoots of the same literary type, the Peloponnesian dithyramb." Arion called his performances of caprine satyrs dramas and was the first to use the word in this sense (pp. 8 ff.). The terms τραγικὸς χορός, τραγῳδία, etc., arose at Sicyon about 590 B.C. and were suggested by the goat-prize, not by the costume of the choreutae (pp. 13 ff.). To ignore Aristotle and "to seek, as many do"—Dieterich, Ridgeway, Harrison, and Murray are specified—"to trace tragedy back to δρώμενα of various kinds by another line of development transgresses good philological practice" (p. 6). The very facility of all such attempts is their own undoing.

Comedy arose from the comus. The claim of the Megarians that comedy originated with them is apparently unwarranted, although Megara probably "had something to do with the introduction of the histrionic element into Attic comedy" (pp. 47 f.). It is wrong to assume, as is frequently done, that comedy had actors before tragedy (p. 48). They were probably not introduced into Athenian comedy until shortly before 450 B.C. (p. 56).

The long, yet all too brief, section dealing with the theater (pp. 57–117) opens with an account of the different parts (1) of the Greek theater, (2) of the Graeco-Roman theater, and the names which were applied to these several members. The most perplexing of these terms are the λογεῖον and the θεολογεῖον. The former the author believes (p. 60 and Fig. 23) was in the Greek theater applied to the top of the proscenium, in the Graeco-Roman theater to the stage. The *theologium* was peculiar to the latter type of theater and was the top of the proscenium which now stood on the stage at the rear (Fig. 24). "There was no stage in the Greek theater until about the beginning of the Christian era" (p. 60). The earliest stage in the Athenian theater was erected in the Neronian period and was probably only about four feet nine inches in height (p. 74). The theater of Vitruvius was of the Graeco-Roman type (pp. 79–87, 92–97), as was also the building presupposed by the passages in Plutarch and Pollux (pp. 78, 98–103). "The only tangible argument for a stage of any height in the fifth century is afforded by the occurrence of the words ἀναβαίνειν and καταβαίνειν" (p. 91). These "are best explained on the basis of the slight difference in level between the orchestra and the floor of the proscenium colonnade, which was probably elevated a step or two above the orchestra and was often used by the dramatic performers" (p. 91; cf. p. 68). "Since the *Acharnians* was produced in 425 B.C., the appearance of ἀναβαίνειν in that play is valuable as affording a *terminus ante quem* for the introduction of a wooden proscenium at Athens" (pp. 91 ff.).

So excellent is the work thus inadequately outlined and so great the service which its publication has rendered that one hesitates to indulge in criticisms. Yet many of the conclusions and many of the statements of fact invite discussion. A few of these may perhaps be mentioned without seeming to be ungracious.[1]

[1] For a criticism of certain archaeological details the reader should consult Professor D. M. Robinson's excellent review in *Classical Weekly*, X (1918), 63 ff.

The statement made on the authority of Dörpfeld that the theater at Athens when reconstructed was moved "some fifty feet farther north" (pp. 68, 65) is, I believe, an error. It can be shown, I think, that the theater was moved only thirty feet, but the evidence for this view did not appear until the very month in which Professor Flickinger's book came from the press (see my "Key to the Reconstruction of the Fifth-Century Theater at Athens," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology,* V [1918], 55 ff.). If the argument of this paper be sound, it follows that the further statement (p. 68) that "there are no means of determining whether this slight change in site was made at this period [*ca.* 425?] or about 465 B.C., when the first scene-building was erected," is also in error. That the change could not have been made in 465 is, I believe, certain. Unfortunately dogmatic is the statement (p. 66), after Dörpfeld, that the early "scene-building was set up behind the orchestra where the declivity had been," or (he adds in a footnote) "in the south half of the old orchestra in case the orchestra was moved fifty feet nearer the Acropolis at this time." The reason for this restriction does not appear. In any case there should have been included some discussion of the alternative view that the scene-building was erected on the orchestra before the theater was moved, as suggested by von Wilamowitz, Robert, and others. The omission is unfortunate, for the general reader, unacquainted as he is apt to be with the special literature of the subject, is at the mercy of the author. A few more notes upon such disputable points would have greatly increased the usefulness of the book without adding materially to its cost.

The invention of scene-painting is ascribed to the decade ending in 458 B.C., and, the author continues, "this would mean that at first scenery must have been attached directly to the scene-building itself and not inserted between the intercolumniations of the proscenium colonnade" (p. 66). Why? The only reason adduced is the unsupported assumption that the early scene-building had neither parascenia nor a columned proscenium. Nor is any reason offered for the hypothesis that the floor of the proscenium colonnade was raised a step or two above the level of the orchestra (see above). Doubtless the influence of Dörpfeld and Reisch (*Das griechische Theater*) is responsible for this assumption, but the thesis appears not to be supported by any valid evidence, and the interpretation of ἀναβαίνειν and καταβαίνειν based thereon is, I believe, false. Dicaeopolis did not set up his market in the proscenium, but in the orchestra.

The question regarding the manner in which the chorus entered the orchestra is not satisfactorily treated. The statement that the chorus was enabled "to enter the orchestra in three files of five men each and to retain this formation for their dance movements" (p. 134) does not tell the whole story. One searches in vain too for a systematic discussion of the manner of acting either of chorus or of actors, and this seems to me to be one of the most serious omissions. With the exception of the mask, the costume of the tragic actor also receives scant notice. It surely is deserving of more than seven

lines, and that too in a footnote (p. 162)! No hint is given that the Rieti statuette (Fig. 66) represents an actor of a late period, and the failure to reproduce or even to mention the charming actor-relief from the Peiraeus is regrettable. The discussion of the use of masks (pp. 221 ff.) does not at all points carry conviction. This is particularly true of the thesis that "the dramatists sometimes try to explain the immobility of the actor's mask," as in Sophocles' *Electra*. When Electra unexpectedly holds her brother in her arms, alive and well, "not a spark of joy can scintillate across her wooden features, either then or later. Her subsequent passivity is motivated by Orestes' request that she continue her lamentations and not allow their mother to read her secret in her radiant face (vss. 1296 ff.)," etc. This interpretation is due of course to Hense (*Die Modificirung der Maske in der griechischen Tragödie* [1905], p. 5), but I have always regarded it with suspicion. The very expression φαιδρῷ προσώπῳ (vs. 1297) gives one pause. Moreover (vs. 1227), Electra turns to the chorus and exclaims: ὦ φίλταται γυναῖκες, ὦ πολίτιδες, ὁρᾶτ' Ὀρέστην τόνδε, κτλ. Again—and this is overlooked both by Hense and by Professor Flickinger—after Electra has promised that her mother will never see her face lit up with smiles (vs. 1310), she greets the aged attendant with rapturous joy (vss. 1354 ff.). This perhaps proves nothing. But Hense's inept and unimaginative explanation is surely as wooden as the alleged "wooden feature" of Electra's mask. One is reminded of Wecklein's exquisitely poetical interpretation of the marvelous line in the *Agamemnon* (vs. 1267): ἄλλην τιν' ἄτης ἀντ' ἐμοῦ πλουτίζετε, that "der Vers scheint unecht zu sein; denn der vernichtete Kranz kann niemanden mehr dienen!" "*Boeotum in crasso jurares aëre natum.*"

Similarly unconvincing is the statement that in the *Eumenides* "the furies sing their first song behind the scenes . . . . ; presently Apollo drives them from his sanctuary into the orchestra" (p. 151; cf. p. 250). Later (p. 287) this scene is somewhat differently interpreted and the suggestion is proposed that possibly the ghost of Clytemnestra also "is merely heard from within the scene-building." To my thinking this is inconceivable. Again the statement (p. 259) that "a whole trilogy was no longer than an average modern play" cannot be right. The time required for the presentation of the average modern play does not exceed two and a half hours. The unabridged *Hamlet* contains 3,924 lines and requires five hours, exclusive of intermissions, for its performance. *Macbeth* consists of but 2,000 lines. But the average length of a Sophoclean or a Euripidean trilogy was evidently about 4,500 verses. Even the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus comprises 3,800 verses. Müller (*Bühnenalterthümer*, p. 323) estimates the time required for a tetralogy as from seven to eight hours.

The bibliographies constitute one of the valuable features of the book, and yet there are several rather serious omissions. Indeed, a close scrutiny of the bibliography reveals the fact that, with the exception of a few reviews by the author himself and two or three works mentioned in the Preface, there

are only five references to articles or treatises which appeared more recently than 1915. The reason for this is puzzling. Doubtless the war should be held responsible for some of the omissions, but it is to be hoped that when the book is revised the bibliography will be made somewhat fuller—why, for example, are only two of Robert's many able articles cited?—and brought down to date. The two indexes are full and executed with gratifying care. Personally, however, I should prefer to have the two combined; it would save the reader a considerable amount of time. One misses the words "entrances," "painting," "theophanies," and "theoric fund." Under the word "curtain" the last citation should be page 311. Other misprints are rare. There are two on page 302, and the date of Felsch's dissertation (p. 246) is given incorrectly. It should be 1906.

Many other matters invite comment, but their consideration would greatly lengthen this review, which is already too long. For the production of so monumental and so trustworthy a volume Professor Flickinger deserves both gratitude and congratulation.

<div align="right">JAMES TURNEY ALLEN</div>

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Notice sur le manuscrit Latin 4788 du vatican. By ANTOINE THOMAS. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1917.

This is a very interesting document and Professor Thomas has done a service to mediaeval and indirectly to classical scholarship by publishing in sufficient extracts its substance, with Index and glossary. A Pierre de Paris had been known since 1692 as author of a manuscript translation of the Psalms, and the present manuscript by a Pierre de Paris was described in 1889 by M. Ernest Langlois. Professor Thomas establishes the identity of the two Pierres by the style and also by the fact that Simon Le Rat, to whom the translation of the Psalms is dedicated, lived at Cyprus from 1299 to 1310, where the author of the commentary tells us he also lived and where he says he wrote a translation of Aristotle's *Politics* and a work on philosophy dedicated to the Seigneur de Tyr, i.e., Amauri de Lusignan. The naïveté and the spelling of Pierre's fourteenth-century French are intelligible and very amusing to the amateur. Professor Thomas says that it shows the influence of the dialect of Venice, and his glossary records about fifty words not found in the *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* of Frédéric Godefroy. Leaving this topic to reviewers of special competence I will merely give a few illustrations of the main interest of the document and the light it throws on the culture and classical scholarship of the early fourteenth century.

Pierre is not able to construe Boethius' Latin correctly, still less his Greek quotations, and the few names of classical literature and mythology and the anecdotes of ancient history of which he has heard are jumbled in inextricable confusion in his mind. We could almost match from this single treatise

the list in Professor Kittredge's "Chaucer's Lollius" (*Harvard Studies*, XXVIII, 81) of the howlers which a poet might commit in the fourteenth century. Alcibiades is a seductive damsel wooed by Alexander and Aristotle, Epygurien is derived from the Greek epy, "under," and gyros, "pig," and means "home menant vie de porc." Socrates was poisoned by the roy Got in presence of Plato because he refused to destroy two virtuous men, Filatus and Omer. Vesseus (Vesuvius) is a *furiosité* who reigns in hell. Parmenides masquerades as Carparmentes. It would be easy to infer too much from this. Tredwell's *Apollonius of Tyana*, published in New York in 1886, would furnish almost as good an anthology of Quiproquos. Anything may happen when a careless and confident sciolist mixes his notes and his memories. What Professor Thomas calls *sa suffisance imperturbable* leads Pierre on the trail of Boethius into many fields where a modern scholar would venture only with the guidance of a reference library. Pierre bluffs his way through and imperturbably refers to his alleged translation of the *Politics* or the *De Caelo* for things not dreamed of in Aristotle's philosophy. Professor Thomas does not attempt to write an exhaustive monograph on the sources and psychology of Pierre's blunders. A plausible explanation of the strange jargon which he makes of Boethius' Greek quotations would be the hypothesis that he consulted some Cyprian Barlaam who, himself unable to translate the classical Greek, substituted for it edifying short sentences of his own which Pierre took down by ear, together with his guide's translation of them.

A specialist in mediaeval philosophy could perhaps discover the sources of the singular disquisition on time in Pierre's prologue. He himself refers to the *liber de causis* attributed to Aristotle. But that affirms (sec. 4) *prima rerum creatarum est esse*, while Pierre's thesis is (p. 11) "la premiere creature que nostre Sire Dieus forma si fu le Tens." Pierre goes on to argue Platonically or neo-Platonically "que les formes de toutes les choses estoyent en la pensée de Dieu avant que le Tens." But no "forme esperituele" outside of the Trinity could have been produced outside of or before time in the Non-Tens. For in that case such forms would be sempiternal and without beginning, like God himself. This is derived directly or indirectly from Plato's *Timaeus*. But I cannot give the source, if any, of Pierre's ingenious argument that time is a cause of life in creatures and a living thing itself because it grows, six hours annually, necessitating an interpolated day every four years.

The reference (p. 42) to a book of Aristotle "apele le livre des Derreniers" at first seems very blind, but on reflection it is obviously the *Analytica Posteriora*, and there we in fact find *au comensement* Pierre's statement "que toutes les doctrines et toutes les sciences sont fait de une conoissance de devant." These are only specimens of the dissertation which Professor Thomas declines to write and which this reviewer at present has no ambition to undertake.

<div align="right">PAUL SHOREY</div>